

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
FOI/PA
DELETED PAGE INFORMATION SHEET
FOI/PA# 1215237-0

Total Deleted Page(s) = 109

Page 11 ~ Duplicate;
Page 12 ~ Duplicate;
Page 13 ~ Duplicate;
Page 14 ~ Duplicate;
Page 15 ~ Duplicate;
Page 16 ~ Duplicate;
Page 17 ~ Duplicate;
Page 18 ~ Duplicate;
Page 19 ~ Duplicate;
Page 20 ~ Duplicate;
Page 21 ~ Duplicate;
Page 22 ~ Duplicate;
Page 23 ~ Duplicate;
Page 24 ~ Duplicate;
Page 25 ~ Duplicate;
Page 26 ~ Duplicate;
Page 27 ~ Duplicate;
Page 28 ~ Duplicate;
Page 29 ~ Duplicate;
Page 34 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 35 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 36 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 37 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 54 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 55 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 56 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 57 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 58 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 66 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 67 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 68 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 69 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 70 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 71 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 88 ~ b3; b6; b7C;
Page 89 ~ b3;
Page 90 ~ b3;
Page 91 ~ b3; b6; b7C;
Page 92 ~ b3; b6; b7C;
Page 100 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 101 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 102 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 103 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 104 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 105 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 106 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 107 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 108 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;

Page 109 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 110 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 144 ~ b6; b7C;
Page 154 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 155 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 156 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 157 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 158 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 159 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 160 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 161 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 162 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 163 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 195 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 196 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 198 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 205 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 206 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 214 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 215 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 219 ~ b6; b7C;
Page 220 ~ b6; b7C;
Page 227 ~ b6; b7C;
Page 228 ~ b6; b7C;
Page 229 ~ b6; b7C;
Page 255 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 256 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 257 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 286 ~ b6; b7C;
Page 287 ~ b6; b7C;
Page 288 ~ b6; b7C;
Page 289 ~ b6; b7C;
Page 290 ~ b6; b7C;
Page 291 ~ b6; b7C;
Page 292 ~ b6; b7C;
Page 293 ~ b6; b7C;
Page 304 ~ b6; b7C;
Page 305 ~ b6; b7C;
Page 306 ~ b6; b7C;
Page 307 ~ b6; b7C;
Page 308 ~ b6; b7C;
Page 309 ~ b6; b7C;
Page 310 ~ b6; b7C;
Page 311 ~ b6; b7C;
Page 312 ~ b6; b7C;
Page 313 ~ b6; b7C;
Page 314 ~ b6; b7C;
Page 315 ~ b6; b7C;
Page 316 ~ b6; b7C;
Page 317 ~ b6; b7C;
Page 318 ~ b6; b7C;
Page 319 ~ b6; b7C;
Page 320 ~ b6; b7C;
Page 321 ~ b6; b7C;

Page 325 ~ b3;
Page 326 ~ b3;
Page 329 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 330 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 359 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 371 ~ b3;
Page 372 ~ b3;

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
X Deleted Page(s) X
X No Duplication Fee X
X For this Page X
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

(01/26/1998)

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Precedence: ROUTINE

Date: 07/28/1999

To: Chicago

Attn: [REDACTED]

WC-3 ROLOF

b6
b7C

From: Chicago

WC-3

Contact: SA [REDACTED]

x2698

Approved By: [REDACTED]

Drafted By: [REDACTED]:rpw

Case ID #: 194B-CG-110663 (Pending)

Title: CALVIN SUTKER,
COOK COUNTY COMMISSIONER,
13TH DISTRICT;
BARBARA PANOZZO;
[REDACTED]

CSLPO-STATE LEVEL;
OO: CHICAGO

(X) [REDACTED]

Synopsis: Request the following subfiles be opened as necessary.

Details: The following subfiles need to be opened in the above-captioned case:

| <u>Code</u> | <u>Standard Subfile</u> |
|-------------|---------------------------------------|
| 302 | 302s and Inserts |
| FISUR | Physical Surveillance |
| BI | Background and Historical Information |
| SBP | Subpoenas |
| MC | Mail Cover |

♦♦

James - Ot A
Sub 302
SA [REDACTED]
7/27/99
8/2/99

b6
b7C

194B-CG-110663-302-1

209RPW04.EC

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 06/29/1999

On 06/29/1999, the following investigation was conducted by Special Agent (SA) [REDACTED] FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION (FBI):

b6
b7C

At approximately 8:30 a.m., SA [REDACTED] placed a telephone call from a cellular phone, [REDACTED] to the office of Commissioner CALVIN SUTKER, (312) 603-6383. An unidentified female answered the call and informed SA [REDACTED] who had not identified himself as a Special Agent, that BARBARA PANOZZO was not in the office because she was at meetings "off site." The unidentified female also stated PANOZZO did not have voicemail and that tomorrow would probably be a better day to try to reach PANOZZO at the office.

b6
b7C

(Handwritten: 21 Syn)

Investigation on 06/29/1999 at Chicago, Illinois

File # 194B-CG-110663 Sub 302 - 2 Date dictated 06/29/1999

by SA [REDACTED]

b6
b7C

(Handwritten: 180RPN02.302)

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 07/20/1999

On 07/20/1999, [REDACTED] (PROTECT IDENTITIY), [REDACTED]

[REDACTED], was shown an array of photographs. [REDACTED] identified the white male in photographs taken 07/13/1999 and labeled NEG#22, NEG#24, NEG#4A, and NEG#6A on the back as being [REDACTED] identified the white female with white hair, wearing a white sweatshirt and blue shorts in photographs taken 06/29/1999 and labeled NEG# 1, NEG# 2, and NEG# 8 on the back, as being BARBARA PANOZZO. The undersigned agent initialed the back of the above-referenced photographs and retained them for evidentiary purposes and place them in a 1A envelope.

b6
b7C
b7DInvestigation on 07/20/1999 at Chicago, IllinoisFile # 194-CG-110663 Sub 302 -3 Date dictated 07/20/1999by SA [REDACTED] *RPW*b6
b7C

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 09/14/1999

On 09/13/1999, Special Agent (SA) [REDACTED]
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION (FBI). received [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] were received
pursuant to a Federal Grand Jury subpoena requiring the
[REDACTED]

b3

The [REDACTED] were placed
into a 1-A envelope for future retrieval.

[Handwritten signature]

Investigation on 09/13/1999 at Chicago, Illinois

File # 194B-CG-110663 Sub 302 -4 Date dictated 09/14/1999

by SA [REDACTED]

[Handwritten signature]

b6
b7c

257R/1003.302

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 12/27/1999

[redacted]
[redacted]
[redacted] telephone [redacted] provided Special Agent (SA) [redacted]
[redacted] FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION (FBI) with photocopies of
[redacted]
[redacted] pursuant to a Federal Grand
Jury Subpoena requesting [redacted]
[redacted]
were as follows:

[redacted]

A copy of [redacted]
[redacted] are attached to this FD-302 for future reference. The
original [redacted] were placed in a 1A
envelope for future retrieval.

Investigation on 11/05/1999 at Chicago, IllinoisFile # 194B-CG-110663-302-5 Date dictated 12/27/1999

by SA [redacted]

rpw *RPW*

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 02/11/2000

[redacted]
[redacted] telephone [redacted] was contacted by the undersigned agent after leaving a message on February 11, 2000 indicating that he represented [redacted]. After [redacted] was contacted and the undersigned agent identified himself, [redacted] provided the following information:

b6
b7C

[redacted] indicated that he had been retained to represent [redacted] in the federal investigation involving [redacted]. [redacted] related that [redacted] would be requesting a continuance of [redacted] Grand Jury date, set for [redacted] and indicated that [redacted] had been made aware that [redacted] would be doing the same. [redacted] indicated that he would make his client available to meet with the United States Attorney's Office and was informed that AUSA [redacted] telephone [redacted] was handling the matter and should be contacted regarding the request for a continuance.

b3
b6
b7C

[redacted] indicated that [redacted] had retained [redacted] to represent him and wanted [redacted] to do the same. [redacted] stated that [redacted] was afraid that he would [redacted] if he did not do it, but was going to tell [redacted] that [redacted] was a [redacted]

b6
b7C

[redacted] indicated that [redacted] had been seen leaving the federal building by an individual named [redacted] and felt as though he had to inform [redacted] of the investigation after [redacted] recognized him.

b3
b6
b7CInvestigation on 02/11/2000 at Chicago, Illinois (telephonically)File # 194B-CG-110663-302 -6 Date dictated 02/11/2000by SA [redacted] RPWb6
b7C

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 09/29/1999

[redacted] (PROTECT IDENTITY), [redacted]
[redacted] was interviewed at her residence. Also
present during portions of the interview were [redacted]
[redacted] and [redacted]
[redacted] After
being advised of the identity of the interviewing agents and the
purpose of the interview, [redacted] provided the following
information:

b6
b7C
b7D

[redacted] advised that [redacted]
[redacted] CALVIN SUTKER in SUTKER's
downtown office, 118 North Clark Street, Chicago, Illinois.
[redacted] stated that [redacted]

b6
b7C
b7D

[redacted]

[redacted] advised that she had recently [redacted]
[redacted]

b6
b7C
b7DInvestigation on 09/28/1999 at Chicago, IllinoisFile # 194B-CG-110663-302-57 Date dictated 09/29/1999

by SA [redacted] KSS

b6
b7C

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 02/10/2000

[redacted] was interviewed at her place of
employment. [redacted]
[redacted] After being
advised of the identity of the interviewing agents and the
purpose of the interview, [redacted] provided the following
information:

b3

b3

Investigation on 02/10/2000 at Chicago, IllinoisFile # 194B-CG-110663-302-8 Date dictated 02/10/2000by SA [redacted] :rpw
SA [redacted] KSSb6
b7C

194B-CG-110663-302

Continuation of FD-302 of , On 02/10/2000, Page 2

b3

were served with United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois, subpoenas, commanding their appearance on

b3

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 02/10/2000

[redacted]
[redacted] was served and accepted two United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois, subpoenas, at his residence at approximately 7:15 p.m. following a brief interview by Special Agents (SA) [redacted] and [redacted] FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION (FBI). After being advised of the identify of the interviewing agents and the purpose of the interview, [redacted] provided the following information:

[redacted]
[redacted] at the above-referenced address [redacted] stated that he was [redacted] Cook County Commissioner CALVIN SUTKER [redacted]

[redacted] SUTKER.

After being asked what [redacted] [redacted] inquired as to the nature of the interviewing agents interest in talking [redacted] [redacted] was informed that the FBI had received some allegations concerning [redacted] SUTKER's office. [redacted] asked who the source of the complaint was and was informed that the initial complaint received was anonymous. [redacted] asked if the FBI investigated all anonymous complaints and stated that [redacted] of the complaint, but refused to tell the interviewing agents.

[redacted] then indicated that he thought that the interviewing agents should speak to [redacted] attorney and accepted the subpoenas for [redacted] commanding their appearance in front of the Grand Jury on [redacted] [redacted] commented that he thought it was unusual that subpoenas were being served on an anonymous complaint and stated [redacted]

[redacted] and asked for the interviewing agents names again. [redacted] was provided with business cards for the interviewing agents.

Investigation on 02/09/2000 at Chicago, Illinois

File # 194B-CG-110663-302 - 9 Date dictated 02/10/2000

SA [redacted] rpw, SA [redacted]
by SA [redacted]

194B-CG-110663-302

Continuation of FD-302 of _____, On 02/09/2000, Page 2

b3

Shortly after the initial interview, _____ was observed looking out the window of his residence and twice exited the residence and jogged a short distance from his residence.

At approximately 7:45 p.m., SAs _____ approached _____ residence and informed _____ that the Agents outside his residence were not trying to hide from him and did not want to create a situation where _____ was leaving _____ inside because he was worried about the Agents presence outside his home. SA _____ informed _____ that the Agents simply wanted to speak with _____ about the same matter they had discussed with him and offered to give him _____ Grand Jury subpoena and depart the area. _____ refused to accept the subpoena and stated that he was uncomfortable accepting it, but understood the agents were just doing their job. _____ then reentered his residence.

b3

At approximately 8:00 p.m., _____ exited his residence and gestured for Agents to approach him. SAs _____ and _____ walked towards _____ residence and _____ indicated that he would accept _____ subpoena. _____ stated that he did not know where _____ was and did not know when he would return home. The interview was then terminated and Agents in the vicinity of _____ residence departed.

b3

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 02/04/2000

[redacted] previously interviewed, was contacted telephonically after [redacted] returned a page from the undersigned agent. After the undersigned agent identified himself, [redacted] was informed not to provide the undersigned agent with any documents that he did not otherwise have access to those he was [redacted]

CALVIN SUTKER. [redacted] indicated that he understood these limitations and would abide by them.

b6
b7C
b7D

Investigation on 02/04/2000 at Chicago, Illinois (telephonically)

File # 194B-CG-110663-302 -10 Date dictated 02/04/2000

by SA [redacted]:rpw^{RPW}

b6
b7C

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 02/03/2000

[redacted] date of birth [redacted] social security
account number [redacted]
telephone [redacted] work telephone [redacted] pager
[redacted] was interviewed at the Chicago Office of the
Federal Bureau of Investigation, 219 South Dearborn Street,
Chicago, Illinois. After being advised of the identity of the
interviewing agents and the purpose of the interview, [redacted]
provided the following information:

b6
b7C
b7Db6
b7C
b7DInvestigation on 02/02/2000 at Chicago, IllinoisFile # 194B-CG-110663-302 -11 Date dictated 02/03/2000by SA [redacted]
SA [redacted]

rpw

b6
b7C

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 02/15/2000

[redacted] previously interviewed, was interviewed in the Office of the United States Attorney, 219 South Dearborn, Chicago, Illinois. Also present during the interview were Assistant United States Attorney (AUSA) [redacted] and [redacted] attorney, [redacted]. After being advised of the identity of the interviewing agent and AUSA [redacted] provided the following information pursuant to a proffer agreement:

b6
b7C
b7Db6
b7C
b7DInvestigation on 02/14/2000 at Chicago, IllinoisFile # 194B-CG-110663-302 -12 Date dictated 02/15/2000by SA [redacted] rpw ^{RPW}b6
b7C

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 02/25/2000

[redacted]
[redacted]
[redacted] telephone [redacted] was interviewed telephonically at his place of employment. After being advised of the identity of the interviewing agent and the purpose of the interview, [redacted] provided the following information:

[redacted] stated that as the [redacted]
[redacted] he did not oversee the day-to-day operations of the [redacted]
[redacted] in the Chicago metro area. [redacted]
[redacted] indicated that the [redacted]
[redacted] would be responsible for handling these day-to-day operations in the [redacted]
[redacted]

[redacted] indicated that the [redacted] position was a new layer of management created by [redacted] and his staff. [redacted] stated that the [redacted] worked in conjunction with the existing [redacted] also called [redacted] [redacted] to manage the [redacted]
[redacted].

[redacted] stated that [redacted]
[redacted] was responsible for hiring all of the [redacted] and initially for supervising them. [redacted] indicated that [redacted] would be responsible for all personnel decisions relating to the [redacted] [redacted] stated that he would have approved the paperwork authorizing the hiring of the [redacted] but he never met them or had anything else to do with their hiring or placement.

[redacted] stated that he recognized the name [redacted] [redacted] from the recent publicity regarding Cook County Commissioner CAL SUTKER and recalled seeing some [redacted] [redacted] but indicated that he had never met [redacted] or had anything to do [redacted] [redacted] stated that it was his understanding that [redacted] was know reporting to [redacted]

Investigation on 02/24/2000 at Chicago, Illinois (telephonically)

File # 194B-CG-110663-302 ⁻¹³ Date dictated 02/25/2000

by SA [redacted] :rpw ^{RAW}

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 02/23/2000

On February 22, 2000, [redacted]
[redacted] provided Assistant United
States Attorney (AUSA) [redacted] and
[redacted] to a subpoena duces tecum served upon [redacted]
by Special Agent (SA) [redacted] FEDERAL BUREAU OF
INVESTIGATION (FBI).

b3

The correspondence indicated that [redacted]
[redacted]

b3

On February 23, 2000, AUSA [redacted] provided SA [redacted] with
the [redacted] which have been
placed into a 1A envelope for future retrieval.

b3

Investigation on 02/22/2000 at Chicago, Illinois

File # 194B-CG-110663-302 -14 Date dictated 02/23/2000

by SA [redacted] rpw *rpw*

b6
b7C

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 02/18/2000

[redacted]
[redacted] telephone
[redacted] was interviewed at her place of employment.
After being advised of the identity of the interviewing agent and
the purpose of the interview, [redacted] provided the following
information:

b3

[redacted] provided the interviewing agent with [redacted]
[redacted] in partial
compliance of a subpoena duces tecum on February 17, 2000.
[redacted] explained that [redacted]
[redacted]

b3

[redacted] stated that the [redacted] also
identified [redacted]
[redacted]
[redacted]

b3

The [redacted] were placed into a 1A envelope
for future retrieval.

Investigation on 02/17/2000 at Chicago, Illinois

File # 194B-CG-110663-302-15 Date dictated 02/18/2000

by SA [redacted]:rpw

b6
b7C

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 02/22/2000

[redacted]
[redacted] telephone
[redacted] was interviewed after contacting writer
telephonically. After being advised of the identity of the
interviewing agent and the purpose of the interview, [redacted]
provided the following information:

b3

[redacted] stated that she had confirmed that neither the

[redacted]

b3

[redacted] indicated that she would contact [redacted] to see
what [redacted]

[redacted]

b3

Investigation on 02/22/2000 at Chicago, Illinois (telephonically)

File # 194B-CG-110663-302 ¹⁶ Date dictated 02/22/2000

by SA [redacted] :rpw ^{RW}

b6
b7C

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 02/23/2000

[redacted]
telephone [redacted] was interviewed at the Office of the United States Attorney, 219 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois. [redacted] attorney, [redacted] and Assistant United States Attorney (AUSA) [redacted] were also present during the interview. After being advised of the identity of the interviewing agent and AUSA [redacted] provided the following information:

b3

b3

b3

b3
b6
b7C

b3

Investigation on 02/22/2000 at Chicago, IllinoisFile # 194B-CG-110663-302 -17 Date dictated 02/23/2000by SA [redacted] :rpw^{RPW}b6
b7C

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 02/28/2000

[redacted] (previously interviewed), [redacted]
[redacted] telephone [redacted] was interviewed at
[redacted]
telephone [redacted] attorney, [redacted] and
Assistant United State's Attorney [redacted] were also present
during the interview. After being advised of the identity of
[redacted] and the interviewing agent, [redacted] provided the following
information pursuant to a proffer agreement:

b6
b7C
b7Db6
b7C
b7DInvestigation on 02/25/2000 at Chicago, IllinoisFile # 194B-CG-110663-302 -18 Date dictated 02/28/2000by SA [redacted] :rpw *RPW*b6
b7C

194B-CG-110663-302

RPW:rpw *rpw*

On Monday, February 28, 2000, writer was contacted by [redacted]
[redacted] indicated that he was
in the process of completing compliance with a United States
District Court Grand Jury subpoena. [redacted] anticipated that he
would complete the process [redacted]
approximately one week.

b3

194B-CG-110663-302-19

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 02/28/2000

[redacted] (previously interviewed) [redacted]
[redacted]
[redacted] telephone [redacted] was interviewed telephonically at his place of employment. After being advised of the identity of the interviewing agents and the purpose of the interview, [redacted] provided the following information:

b6
b7C

[redacted] stated that [redacted]
[redacted]

b6
b7C

[redacted] stated that the idea for the [redacted]
[redacted] in March, 1999. [redacted] recalled that he first spoke to Cook County Commissioner CALVIN SUTKER at [redacted]
[redacted]

b6
b7C

[redacted] stated that the approval for the [redacted]
came through in June, 1999. [redacted] stated that [redacted]
[redacted] SUTKER
[redacted]
[redacted] SUTKER [redacted]

b6
b7C

[redacted] indicated that [redacted] had located the paperwork documenting [redacted]
[redacted]

b6
b7C

[redacted] faxed the undersigned agent a copy of these records, which were placed into a 1A envelope for future retrieval.

Investigation on 02/28/2000 at Chicago, Illinois (telephonically)

File # 194B-CG-110663-302 -20 Date dictated 02/28/2000

by SA [redacted]:rpw ^{RPW}

b6
b7C

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 02/29/2000

[redacted]
[redacted] telephone [redacted] was
contacted telephonically at her place of employment. After being
advised of the identity of the interviewing agent and the purpose
of the interview, [redacted] provided the following information:

[redacted] stated that the County computers in each Cook
County Commissioner's office are connected to a local network
server. [redacted] stated that the [redacted] backed up the
information on these network computers every night and did a
complete back up every week to the server. [redacted] stated that
nothing on the personal or "C drive" would be included in these
network backups. [redacted] stated that in order for individual
documents from a Commissioner's office to be put on the server,
one of the users in that Commissioner's office would have to save
the documents to the network. [redacted] stated that she believed
that most of the Commissioner's staff did not do this with most
documents.

Investigation on 02/28/2000 at Chicago, Illinois (telephonically)

File # 194B-CG-110663-302-21 Date dictated 02/29/2000

by SA [redacted]:rpw *RPW*

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 02/28/2000

[redacted] (previously interviewed), [redacted]
[redacted]
[redacted]
telephone [redacted] was interviewed at his place of
employment. Also present during portions of the interview were
[redacted]

[redacted] After being advised of the identity of the
interviewing agents and the purpose of the interview, [redacted]
provided the following information:

[redacted] stated that he knew [redacted] and that
[redacted]
[redacted] stated that the [redacted] position was a
[redacted]
[redacted] stated that there had been [redacted]

b6
b7Cb6
b7Cb6
b7Cb6
b7CInvestigation on 02/25/2000 at Chicago, IllinoisFile # 194B-CG-110663-302 -22 Date dictated 02/28/2000by SA [redacted] *rpw*
SA [redacted]

194B-CG-110663-302

Continuation of FD-302 of [REDACTED], On 02/25/2000, Page 2

[REDACTED]

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] provided the interviewing agents with a list of [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] The document also
listed [REDACTED] with a pager number of [REDACTED] and a home
telephone of [REDACTED] also provided the
interviewing agents with a partial list of [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] pager [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] was the [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] These items were placed
into a 1A envelope for future retrieval.

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] indicated that [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

b6
b7C

194B-CG-110663-302

Continuation of FD-302 of [REDACTED], On 02/25/2000, Page 3

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] stated that he recalled [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] stated that each [REDACTED] is free to make their own schedule within the parameters of the expected work week and within the working hours of the facilities, but it was generally a five day, eight hour-a-day job. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] was now going to report to [REDACTED]

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] recalled [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] recalled that SUTKER called him 2-3 times in the next few months and asked [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED]

b6
b7C

194B-CG-110663-302

Continuation of FD-302 of [REDACTED], On 02/25/2000, Page 4

b6
b7C

at that time he was aware that [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] SUTKER. [REDACTED] stated that in these telephone conversations he told SUTKER [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] SUTKER [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] stated that

SUTKER [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] SUTKER [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED]

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] indicated that all ISOS employees are also subject to a background check, which he knew included a check for any criminal history

[REDACTED] stated that they were aware of and had read about the federal investigation involving [REDACTED] SUTKER. [REDACTED] both stated that they had not discussed the matter with [REDACTED]

b6
b7C

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 02/25/2000

[redacted] telephone [redacted]
[redacted] was interviewed at her place of employment.
After being advised of the identity of the interviewing agent and the purpose of the interview, [redacted] provided the following information:

[redacted] indicated that she had contact [redacted]
[redacted] at approximately 8:11 a.m. on [redacted]
[redacted] about a Grand Jury subpoena requiring the
production of [redacted]
[redacted]

[redacted] indicated that [redacted] her back at
approximately 10:04 a.m. on [redacted] stating that
[redacted]
[redacted] stated that the
[redacted] in the "Author" section of [redacted]
response was [redacted] explained that all of
[redacted] was sent to [redacted] and he responded through her
as well.

[redacted] indicated that she replied to [redacted]
[redacted] at approximately 12:19 p.m. on [redacted] and
explained that she needed all of [redacted]
attempted to give [redacted] told [redacted] that
it was her understanding that [redacted]
[redacted]

[redacted] back at approximately 1:13
p.m. on [redacted] and stated that because of [redacted]
[redacted]
[redacted] continued that all of [redacted]
[redacted]

Following the interview, [redacted] provided the
interviewing agents with a [redacted] which have
been placed into a 1A envelope for future retrieval.

Investigation on 02/24/2000 at Chicago, Illinois

File # 194B-CG-110663-302 -23 Date dictated 02/25/2000

by SA [redacted]

rpw *RMW*

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 02/18/2000

[redacted]
[redacted] telephone [redacted] was interviewed telephonically at her place of employment, [redacted]
[redacted] After being advised of the identity of the interviewing agent, [redacted] provided the following information:

[redacted] advised that she was represented by [redacted] telephone [redacted] and would like any questions directed to him. [redacted] advised that she would accept service of a Grand Jury subpoena at work or at the above-referenced address after 4:30 p.m. and contact her attorney.

At approximately 2:00 p.m. [redacted] was served with and accepted a Grand Jury subpoena, Northern District of Illinois, commanding her presence on [redacted]

Investigation on 02/17/2000 at [redacted]
File # 194B-CG-110663-302 -24 Date dictated 02/18/2000
by SA [redacted] :rpw *RPW*

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 02/17/2000

[redacted]
[redacted]
[redacted] was interviewed at her place of employment. After being advised of the identity of the interviewing agent and the purpose of the interview, [redacted] provided the following information:

[redacted] provided the interviewing agent with [redacted]
[redacted] pursuant to a subpoena duces tecum relating to the

[redacted]

[redacted] indicated that she had been contacted telephonically by several of the [redacted] about the subpoena because it had been in the newspaper. [redacted] indicated that there were [redacted] and that she had spoken to [redacted]. [redacted] indicated that her conversations with the [redacted] had been about the subpoena and what was being requested. [redacted] indicated that [redacted] had also had conversations with some of the [redacted] about the subpoena.

Investigation on 02/16/2000 at [redacted]File # 194B-CG-110663-302-25 Date dictated 02/17/2000by SA [redacted] rpw *RPW*

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 02/14/2000

[redacted]
[redacted]
[redacted] was interviewed at
his place of employment. Also present during portions of the
interview was [redacted] After being
advised of the identity of the interviewing agents and the
purpose of the interview, [redacted] provided the following
information:

b6
b7C

[redacted] advised that he had been employed by the [redacted]

[redacted]

b6
b7CInvestigation on 02/14/2000 at [redacted]b6
b7CFile # 194B-CG-110663-302-26 Date dictated 02/14/2000

by SA [redacted]:rpw RPW

b6
b7C

194B-CG-110663-302

Continuation of FD-302 of [REDACTED], On 02/14/2000, Page 3 b3

[REDACTED] was shown a copy of a subpoena duces tecum
requesting [REDACTED]
but not limited to, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] indicated that [REDACTED] would
be the [REDACTED] and would be the best person to
serve it upon.

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 02/14/2000

[redacted]
[redacted]
[redacted] was interviewed at her place of employment. Also present during portions of the interview was [redacted]. After being advised of the identity of the interviewing agent and the purpose of the interview, [redacted] provided the following information:

b6
b7C

[redacted] indicated that as the [redacted]
[redacted]

b6
b7C

[redacted] indicated that [redacted] would have been required to
[redacted]

b6
b7C

[redacted] was served with and accepted a Grand Jury Subpoena
Duces Tecum Northern District of Illinois requesting [redacted]
[redacted]

b3

Investigation on 02/14/2000 at [redacted]b6
b7CFile # 194B-CG-110663-302 -27Date dictated 02/14/2000by SA [redacted] :rpw *RPW*b6
b7C

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 02/17/2000

[redacted]
[redacted]
[redacted] was interviewed telephonically at her place of employment. After being advised of the identity of the interviewing agent and the purpose of the interview, [redacted] provided the following information:

[redacted] stated that she was aware that [redacted] she provided pursuant to a subpoena duces tecum relating to

[redacted]
[redacted] stated that it did not have anything to do with the subpoena.

[redacted] related that she thought that she had noticed this information was missing approximately one year ago and guessed that the information was inadvertently thrown out. [redacted] stated that the only reason that she [redacted]

Investigation on 02/17/2000 at Chicago, Illinois (telephonically)

File # 194B-CG-110663-302 ⁻²⁸ Date dictated 02/17/2000

by SA [redacted] :rpw ^{rmw}

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 3/1-3/8/2000

[redacted]
[redacted] telephone [redacted] was interviewed at the office of the United States Attorney, 219 South Dearborn, Chicago, Illinois, on February 29, 2000 and March 8, 2000. [redacted] attorney, [redacted] and Assistant United States Attorney (AUSA) [redacted] were also present during the interview. After being advised of the identity of [redacted] and the interviewing agent, [redacted] provided the following information pursuant to a proffer agreement:

b6
b7C
b7Db6
b7C
b7D

Investigation on 2/29-3/8/2000 at Chicago, Illinois

File # 194B-CG-110663-302 ²⁹ Date dictated 3/1-3/8/2000by SA [redacted]:rpw ^{RPW}b6
b7C

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 03/15/2000

[redacted]
[redacted] was interviewed at his place of employment. After being advised of the identity of the interviewing agent and the purpose of the interview, [redacted] provided the following information:

b6
b7C

[redacted] provided the interviewing agent with [redacted]

[redacted]

b3

Investigation on 03/14/2000 at Chicago, IllinoisFile # 194B-CG-110663-302 -30 Date dictated 03/15/2000by SA [redacted] rpw *RPW*b6
b7C

194B-CG-110663-302

Continuation of FD-302 of , On 03/14/2000, Page 2 b3

provided by will remain in the possession of the writer for future retrieval.

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 03/15/2000

On March 15, 2000, writer entered the Cook County Illinois website at "www.co.cook.il.us" and discovered that the Cook County Board of Commissioners had a regular meeting on Tuesday, February 15, 2000. Writer printed out the dates of the regularly scheduled Cook County Board meetings from December, 1997 to December, 2000.

Writer also printed out a biography of 13th District Cook County Commissioner CALVIN SUTKER documenting SUTKER's committee membership, education, and prior work history. A copy of the printouts has been attached for future retrieval.

Investigation on 03/15/2000 at Chicago, Illinois

File # 194C-CG-110663-302-31 Date dictated 03/15/2000

by SA *rpw*

b6
b7C

**RESOLUTION**

Sponsored by

THE HONORABLE JOHN P. DALEY, PRESIDENT JOHN H. STROGER, JR., EARLEAN COLLINS, BOBBIE L. STEELE, JERRY BUTLER, DEBORAH SIMS, WILLIAM R. MORAN, JOSEPH MARIO MORENO, ROBERTO MALDONADO, PETER N. SILVESTRI, MIKE QUIGLEY, TED LECHOWICZ, CALVIN R. SUTKER, GREGG GOSLIN, CARL H. HANSEN, ALLAN C. CARR AND HERBERT T. SCHUMANN, JR., County Commissioners

RESOLUTION**BE IT RESOLVED**

1. That the Board of Commissioners of Cook County shall hold its regular meetings and regular meetings of Finance, Zoning and Building, and Roads and Bridges Committees of the Board on the following dates during 2000:

| | | | |
|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|-----------|
| January 6, 2000 | Thursday | June 20, 2000 | Tuesday |
| January 20, 2000 | Thursday | July 11, 2000 | Tuesday |
| February 4 2, 2000 | Tuesday Wednesday | August 9, 2000 | Wednesday |
| February 15, 2000 | Tuesday | September 7, 2000 | Thursday |
| March 9, 2000 | Thursday | September 19, 2000 | Tuesday |
| March 23, 2000 | Thursday | October 3, 2000 | Tuesday |
| April 4, 2000 | Tuesday | October 17, 2000 | Tuesday |
| April 18, 2000 | Tuesday | November 2, 2000 | Thursday |
| May 2, 2000 | Tuesday | November 21, 2000 | Tuesday |
| May 16, 2000 | Tuesday | December 5, 2000 | Tuesday |
| June 7, 2000 | Wednesday | December 19, 2000 | Tuesday |

2. That the time for holding the above specified meetings is 10:00 o'clock a.m., local time and the place is the County Board Room, Room 567, 118 North Clark Street, Chicago, Illinois, 60602.




























































Approved and adopted this 7th day of December, 1999.

[Back to Home Page](#)



FINANCE COMMITTEE

| Archived Meetings for Fiscal Year 1998 | |
|---|--|
| <p>The following meetings were called by the Finance Chairman to consider specific items referred to the Committee on Finance by the Cook County Board:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> December 1997 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> December 10th January 1998 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> January 28th March 1998 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> March 26th June 1998 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> June 23rd (Regular) June 23rd (Transfer of Funds) July 1998 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> July 30th September 1998 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> September 14th October 1998 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> October 14th | <p>The following meetings of the Committee on Finance coincide with the regularly scheduled Cook County Board Meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> December 1997 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> December 2nd December 16th January 1998 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> January 6th January 22nd February 1998 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> February 3rd February 19th March 1998 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> March 5th March 19th April 1998 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> April 7th April 21st May 1998 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> May 5th May 19th June 1998 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> June 2nd June 16th July 1998 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> July 9th August 1998 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> August 6th September 1998 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> September 1st September 15th October 1998 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> October 6th October 20th November 1998 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> November 5th November 17th |
| Archived Meetings for Fiscal Year 1999 | |
| <p>The following meetings were called by the Finance Chairman to consider specific items referred to the Committee on Finance by the Cook County Board:</p> | <p>The following meetings of the Committee on Finance coincide with the regularly scheduled Cook County Board Meetings:</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
|  December 1998 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No meetings |  December 1998 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>December 2nd</u> <u>December 15th</u> |
|  January 1999 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No meetings |  January 1999 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>January 7th</u> <u>January 20th</u> |
|  February 1999 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>February 9th</u> |  February 1999 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>February 2nd</u> <u>February 18th</u> |
|  March 1999 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>March 24th</u> |  March 1999 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>March 4th</u> <u>March 16th</u> |
|  April 1999 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Meetings |  April 1999 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>April 6th</u> <u>April 22nd</u> |
|  May 1999 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Meetings |  May 1999 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>May 4th</u> <u>May 18th</u> |
|  June 1999 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>June 15th-Regular Business</u> <u>June 15th-Transfer of Funds</u> |  June 1999 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>June 8th</u> <u>June 22nd</u> |
|  July 1999 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Meetings |  July 1999 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>July 8th</u> |
|  August 1999 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>August 10th</u> |  August 1999 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>August 4th</u> |
|  September 1999 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>September 9th</u> |  September 1999 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>September 9th</u> <u>September 22nd</u> |
|  October 1999 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Meetings |  October 1999 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>October 5th</u> <u>October 19th</u> |
|  November 1999 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>November 17th</u> |  November 1999 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>November 9th</u> <u>November 23rd</u> |

Secretary to the County Board Cook County, Illinois



Finance Committee

Finance Committee is a standing committee of the whole where all seventeen commissioners are members. The committee is a legislative body of the Cook County Board that is responsible for reviewing all financial matters and has jurisdiction over all personnel, tax, revenue, bond and financing matters. It considers items such as attorney fees for all court, capital & non-capital cases; bills and claims of vendors; worker's compensation and risk management claims; and all other claims against the County of Cook. It also considers miscellaneous items such as fees and licenses, as well as substantive matters such as ordinances and resolutions submitted by County's Commissioners, Elected Officials, various County Bureaus, and the Office of the President.

Current Meetings Posted

NOTICE

The next regularly scheduled meeting of this Committee will be on:

Thursday, March 9, 2000 @ 10:00 a.m.

Location: County Bldg., 5th Flr., Board Room, Rm. 569, 118 N. Clark Street, Chicago



See the Archived Meetings list below to retrieve Committee Reports.

Committee Members

Chairman: John P. Daley (D)
Vice-Chairman: Allan C. Carr (R)

Additional Members::

Commissioners

Butler (D)
Collins (D)
Goslin (R)
Hansen (R)
Lechowicz (D)
Maldonado (D)
Moran (D)
Moreno (D)
Quigley (D)
Schumann (R)
Silvestri (R)

Steele (D)
Sutker (D)
President Stroger (D)



For contact information - Cook County Board of Commissioners

Subcommittees

Industrial Claims
Labor
Litigation
Real Estate
Tax Delinquency
Tax Revenue

Finance Bid Reports (click on this to view bid report for FY2000)

Administrative Contact: Sapho Sukru Erel **Chairman's Office Contact: Betty Murray**

Archived Meetings (click on this to view reports from FY1998 and FY1999)

The following meetings were called by the Finance Chairman to consider specific items referred to the Committee on Finance by the Cook County Board:

- December 1999
 - No meetings
- January 2000
 - January 26th
- February 2000
 - February 8th
- March 2000
 -
- April 2000
 -
- May 2000
 -
- June 2000
 -
 -
- July 2000
 -
- August 2000
 -
- September 2000
 -
- October 2000
 -
- November 2000
 -

The following meetings of the Committee on Finance coincide with the regularly scheduled Cook County Board Meetings:

- December 1999
 - December 7th
 - December 21st
- January 2000
 - January 6th
 - January 20th
- February 2000
 - February 2nd
 - February 15th
- March 2000
 - March 9th
 - March 23rd
- April 2000
 - April 4th
 - April 18th
- May 2000
 - May 2nd
 - May 16th
- June 2000
 - June 7th
 - June 20th
- July 2000
 - July 11th
- August 2000
 - August 9th
- September 2000
 - September 7th
 - September 19th
- October 2000
 - October 3rd
 - October 17th

November 2000
November 2nd
November 21st

For additional information, go to:



- [Full List of Cook County Board Committees and Subcommittee](#)
- [Cook County Board Meeting Dates for 2000](#)

[Back to Home Page](#)



Copyright © 1999 Secretary to the Cook County Board of Commissioners, Cook County, Illinois.

[\[back to listing\]](#) [\[back to home page\]](#)

| | |
|---|--|
| Calvin Sutker (D) | 13th District |
|  |  (312)603-6383 (Main Office) (847)673-1219 (District Office) Administrative Assistant Barbara Panozzo |
| Chair | Vice-Chair |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personnel Compliance | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information & Technology |
| Member | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administration • Finance • Industrial Claims • Tax Delinquency • Roads & Bridges | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department of Corrections • Health & Hospitalization • Litigation • Tax & Revenue • Zoning & building |
| Education | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University of Chicago Law school, J.D. • University of Chicago, B.A. | |
| Prior Work History | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Representative, Illinois • Forest Preserve District of Cook County, Chief Attorney • Illinois secretary of state, Chief Hearing Officer | |

[\[back to listing\]](#) [\[back to home page\]](#)

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 03/15/2000

[redacted] On March 15, 2000, Investigative Analyst [redacted]
[redacted] Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), provided Special
Agent (SA) [redacted] FBI, with two D-1 Forms and five D-2
Forms on "Friends of Calvin Sutker" that [redacted] received from
the State Board of Elections, 100 West Randolph Street, Suite 14-
100, Chicago, Illinois.

b6
b7c

The D-1 and D-2 forms will remain in the possession of
SA [redacted] for future retrieval.

Investigation on 03/15/2000 at Chicago, Illinois

File # 194B-CG-110663-302 ⁻³² Date dictated 03/15/2000

by SA [redacted] :rpw ^{RW}

b6
b7c

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 03/15/2000

On March 13, 2000, [REDACTED]

b3

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] pursuant to a federal Grand Jury subpoena.

The [REDACTED] will remain in the possession of Special Agent (SA) [REDACTED] FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION (FBI), for future retrieval.

Investigation on 03/13/2000 at Chicago, IllinoisFile # 194B-CG-110663-302 **-33** Date dictated 03/15/2000by SA [REDACTED] :rpw *raw*b6
b7c

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 03/07/2000

[redacted] Attorney for [redacted]
[redacted] was provided
with a one page correspondence and United States District Court,
Northern District of Illinois, Grand Jury Subpoena Duces Tecum by
Special Agent (SA) [redacted] FEDERAL BUREAU OF
INVESTIGATION (FBI).

b6
b7C
b7D

The correspondence, dated March 6, 2000, from Assistant
United States Attorney (AUSA) [redacted] explained the
subpoena, which requested [redacted]

b6
b7C
b7D

[redacted] provided the undersigned agent with a
[redacted] indicating that
in partial compliance with the subpoena he was providing certain

b6
b7C
b7D

[redacted]
[redacted] were placed into a 1A envelope for future
retrieval. A hard copy of [redacted] will be retained by SA
[redacted] for future retrieval.

b7D

Investigation on 03/06/2000 at Chicago, IllinoisFile # 194B-CG-110663-302 -34 Date dictated 03/07/2000by SA [redacted] rpwb6
b7C

067RPW01302

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 03/23/2000

[redacted] (hereinafter [redacted]
[redacted] was interviewed in the office of
the United States Attorney, 219 South Dearborn Street, Chicago,
Illinois. Also present were [redacted] attorney, [redacted]
[redacted] and Assistant United States Attorney (AUSA) [redacted]
[redacted] After being provided with and signing a proffer letter, [redacted]
[redacted] provided the following information:

b6
b7C
b7D

[redacted] stated that he resided at [redacted]
[redacted]

b6
b7C
b7D

[redacted] stated that [redacted]
[redacted]

b6
b7C
b7DInvestigation on 03/22/2000 at Chicago, IllinoisFile # 194B-CG-110663-302-35 Date dictated 03/23/2000by SA [redacted] :rpw *RW*b6
b7C

194B-CG-110663-302

Continuation of FD-302 of [REDACTED], On 03/22/2000, Page 4

[REDACTED]

b6
b7C
b7D

[REDACTED] was aware that [REDACTED] of the subpoenas that had been served recently. [REDACTED] explained that he had discussed the matter with [REDACTED] and recalled that [REDACTED] discussed when the subpoenas were served by the interviewing agent. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] knew about the subpoenas, but he had not had any conversations that he could remember with [REDACTED] about the subpoena and what it was all about.

b3

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 03/23/2000

[redacted] (hereinafter [redacted]
[redacted] was interviewed in the office of
the United States Attorney, 219 South Dearborn Street, Chicago,
Illinois. Also present were [redacted] attorney, [redacted]
[redacted] and Assistant United States Attorney (AUSA) [redacted]
[redacted] After being provided with and signing a proffer letter, [redacted]
[redacted] provided the following information:

b6
b7C
b7D

[Large redacted area]

b6
b7C
b7DInvestigation on 03/22/2000 at Chicago, IllinoisFile # 194B-CG-110663-302-36 Date dictated 03/23/2000by SA [redacted] :rpw ^{RPW}b6
b7C

194B-CG-110663-302

Continuation of FD-302 of

[Redacted]

, On 03/22/2000, Page

4

b6
b7C
b7D

[Redacted]

[Redacted] did not know what [Redacted] knew about [Redacted]
[Redacted] SUTKER other than that he [Redacted] knew
that [Redacted] SUTKER. Neither she or [Redacted]
knew anything about the specifics of what [Redacted] had done or
what exactly the subpoena was about. [Redacted] stated that she
knew SUTKER and had seen him [Redacted] during the last year.

b6
b7C
b7D

[Redacted]

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 03/14/2000

[redacted] Attorney for [redacted] provided the undersigned agent with [redacted] on behalf of his client, [redacted] pursuant to a United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois, Grand Jury Subpoena Duces Tecum previously served on [redacted] by the undersigned agent.

b6
b7C
b7D

[redacted] advised that his client had [redacted] [redacted] indicated that [redacted] had given him the [redacted] after he and [redacted] had last met with the undersigned agent and AUSA [redacted]

b6
b7C
b7D

The [redacted] undated, were to [redacted] [redacted] Both contained the handwritten notation [redacted] in the lower righthand corner.

b6
b7C
b7D

[redacted] informed the interviewing agent that he had also provided [redacted] to SUTKER [redacted]

b6
b7C
b7D

Investigation on 03/14/2000 at Chicago, Illinois

File # 194B-CG-110663-302 -37 Date dictated 03/14/2000

by SA [redacted]:rpw *RPW*

b6
b7C

194B-CG-110663-302

Continuation of FD-302 of _____, On 03/14/2000, Page 2

The undersigned agent initialed each of [REDACTED]
with the following handwritten notation: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] were placed into a 1A envelope for
future retrieval.

b7D

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 02/24/2000

[redacted] date of birth [redacted]
[redacted] telephone [redacted] was interviewed
voluntarily at the Office of the FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
(FBI), 219 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois. After being
advised of the identity of the interviewing agent and the purpose
of the interview, [redacted] provided the following information:

b6
b7C

[redacted] stated that he was currently employed as a
[redacted]

b6
b7C

[redacted] stated that he had been employed with the [redacted]
[redacted]

b6
b7C

Investigation on 02/23/2000 at Chicago, Illinois

File # 194B-CG-110663-302-38 Date dictated 02/24/2000

by SA [redacted] :rpw *RW*

b6
b7C

194B-CG-110663-302

Continuation of FD-302 of [REDACTED], On 02/23/2000, Page 4

[REDACTED]

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] provided the interviewing agent with a manilla envelope filled with documents pertaining to the [REDACTED] indicated that the documents dealt with some of the politics of the [REDACTED] indicated that the documents did not deal with [REDACTED] The interviewing agent has retained possession of the documents for future retrieval.

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 04/17/2000

[redacted]
[redacted]
[redacted] was interviewed at his place of employment. After being advised of the identity of the interviewing agent and the purpose of the interview, [redacted] provided the following information:

b6
b7C

[redacted]

b6
b7C

[redacted] indicated that he knew from talking to [redacted]
[redacted] investigated regarding ghost payrolling in SUTKER's office and indicated that he believes that he saw the investigation in the newspapers.

b6
b7C

[redacted]

b6
b7C

Investigation on 04/17/2000 at [redacted]
File # 194B-CG-110663-302 -39 Date dictated 04/17/2000
by SA [redacted] :rpw ^{RPW}

b6
b7Cb6
b7C

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 04/17/2000

[redacted]
[redacted]
[redacted] was interviewed at his place of employment. After being advised of the identity of the interviewing agent and the purpose of the interview, [redacted] provided the following information:

[redacted]
[redacted] Niles Township Committeeman CALVIN SUTKER. [redacted] stated that he had been involved with [redacted] most of his life. [redacted] explained that his [redacted] SUTKER and he continued to support the organization. [redacted] stated that [redacted] SUTKER [redacted] stated that SUTKER [redacted]

[redacted] stated that he regularly saw SUTKER [redacted] [redacted] stated that sometimes these [redacted]

[redacted] stated that he knew and was aware that BARBARA PANOZZO was SUTKER's Chief-of-Staff, but he did not know what she did on a day-to-day basis. [redacted] stated that he only knew [redacted] and did not know what [redacted] SUTKER in the past. [redacted] explained that this included both [redacted] indicated that he had never worked with [redacted] and had never discussed any work that [redacted] had done with SUTKER with either [redacted] or SUTKER.

[redacted] recalled that he ran into SUTKER [redacted] before and told him (SUTKER) that he was going to speak with the FBI regarding [redacted] and asked what it was about. [redacted]

Investigation on 04/17/2000 at [redacted]
File # 194B-CG-110663-302 -40 Date dictated 04/17/2000
by SA [redacted] :rpw

194B-CG-110663-302

Continuation of FD-302 of [REDACTED], On 04/17/2000, Page 2 b6 b7C

recalled that SUTKER told him to retain an attorney if he was a target and SUTKER stated that he could not discuss it any further because he was involved in the investigation. [REDACTED] indicated that he not discussed the federal investigation with SUTKER on any other occasions.

[REDACTED] indicated that [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] indicated that he had regular contact with the [REDACTED] indicated that he was not aware of SUTKER [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] stated that he did not recall any of the [REDACTED] of the [REDACTED] ever telling him that anyone from SUTKER [REDACTED] presenting them with anything from SUTKER stating this [REDACTED] stated that SUTKER had never mentioned anything about [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

b6
b7C

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 04/09/2000

[redacted] (social security number [redacted]
[redacted] telephone [redacted]
was interviewed at her residence. After being advised of the
identity of the interviewing agents and the purpose of the
interview, [redacted] provided the following information:

b6
b7C

[redacted] indicated that she worked as a [redacted]

[redacted]

b6
b7C

[redacted] indicated that through [redacted]

[redacted]

b6
b7C

[redacted] indicated that
this included Cook County Commissioners [redacted]
[redacted] CALVIN SUTKER. [redacted] indicated that the [redacted] and
other [redacted] met with political officials to
educate them and update them on the things the [redacted] was doing.

[redacted]

Investigation on 04/07/2000 at Skokie, Illinois

File # 194B-CG-110663-302-41212 Date dictated 04/09/2000

SA [redacted] rpw
by SA [redacted] KSS

b6
b7C

194B-CG-110663-302

Continuation of FD-302 of [REDACTED], On 04/07/2000, Page 2

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] that is also an issue [REDACTED] discussed with a number of Commissioners.

[REDACTED] advised that [REDACTED] a number of contacts with SUTKER and his office in [REDACTED] recalled [REDACTED] with SUTKER or his office. [REDACTED] advised

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] advised that she did not know SUTKER's [REDACTED] but advised that she had been to SUTKER's office once in [REDACTED]

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] advised that she met [REDACTED] of SUTKER's at that time outside of SUTKER's office. [REDACTED] advised that she met with SUTKER alone in his office that day.

[REDACTED] advised that she knew and had met BARB PANOZZO, who also worked for SUTKER. [REDACTED] advised that she did not know BARB PANOZZO's title, but indicated that she ran SUTKER's downtown office and had worked for SUTKER for a number of years. [REDACTED] advised that SUTKER also had an office in Skokie, but she did not know who worked there. [REDACTED] indicated that BARB PANOZZO was her initial contact with SUTKER's office and she had spoke to BARB PANOZZO less than a half dozen times about [REDACTED] issues including the [REDACTED]

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] advised that she first met BARB PANOZZO at a SUTKER [REDACTED] indicated that she had [REDACTED]

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] stated that SUTKER had been supportive of [REDACTED] and the work they were doing.

194B-CG-110663-302

Continuation of FD-302 of [REDACTED], On 04/07/2000, Page 3

[REDACTED] indicated that during her meetings and conversations with SUTKER and BARB PANOZZO she had never heard the name [REDACTED] or heard anyone mention that someone in SUTKER's office [REDACTED] stated that BARB PANOZZO had never told her that [REDACTED] SUTKER or mentioned that [REDACTED]

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] advised that she had seen some newspaper articles concerning SUTKER and knew that he was being investigated regarding [REDACTED] [REDACTED] stated that she did not know anything about [REDACTED] had never met him, and had never heard of any [REDACTED] SUTKER.

[REDACTED] indicated that she was not aware of anything else that SUTKER [REDACTED] [REDACTED] advised that she knew that SUTKER had appointed [REDACTED]

b6
b7C

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] advised that the [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] but indicated that she had not done any work with anyone from this part of [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] advised that she had worked with a few people from the [REDACTED]

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] advised the [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] doubted that either of them would have had contact with [REDACTED] and indicated that she had never heard them mention him. [REDACTED] advised that the [REDACTED] were run by the [REDACTED]

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 02/17/2000

[redacted]
[redacted]
[redacted] telephone [redacted] was interviewed telephonically at his place of employment. After being advised of the identity of the interviewing agent and the purpose of the interview, [redacted] provided the following information:

b6
b7C

[redacted] indicated that he had been contacted telephonically by [redacted] approximately one half hour after the undersigned agent interviewed him on [redacted]. [redacted] explained that [redacted] wanted to know what the investigation and subpoena were about.

b3
b6
b7C

[redacted] also stated that [redacted] contacted him after he was quoted in the newspaper concerning the subpoena the next day. [redacted] stated that [redacted] was upset with him over the way he dealt with the media.

b3
b6
b7C

[redacted] stated that [redacted] told him that she had spoken to [redacted] but he did not know what she had told them.

b6
b7C

Investigation on 02/17/2000 at Chicago, Illinois (telephonically)

File # 194B-CG-110663-302 - 4/2 Date dictated 02/17/2000

by SA [redacted]:rpw RPW

b6
b7C

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 04/28/2000

[redacted]
[redacted]
[redacted] telephone [redacted] was interviewed at his office. After being advised of the identity of the interviewing agents and the nature of the interview, [redacted] provided the following information:

b6
b7C

[redacted] stated that [redacted] began working for the [redacted]
[redacted] and may have provided a resume although [redacted] was unable to locate a copy of it. [redacted] did however, provide the interviewing agents with a copy of the [redacted]
[redacted]
[redacted]

b6
b7CInvestigation on 04/28/2000 at Chicago, IllinoisFile # 194B-CG-110663-302-43 Date dictated 04/28/2000by SA [redacted]
[redacted]b6
b7C

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 04/12/2000

[redacted]
[redacted]
[redacted] was interviewed at his office. After being advised of the identities of the interviewing agents, [redacted] provided the following information:

b6
b7Cb6
b7C

[redacted] said that he works more closely with some Cook County commissioners than he does others, but generally [redacted]. He characterized his relationship with Commissioner Calvin Sutker as professional with only occasional social meetings [redacted] and Sutker first met in the [redacted]. [redacted] had met Sutker's staff and specifically identified [redacted] people: Barbara Panozzo [redacted].

b6
b7C

[redacted] said he could have heard [redacted] name but could not "put a face with the name". He said that although he does not generally know all of the commissioners' staff employees, he was familiar with most of Commissioner Sutker's staff by site including Barbara Panozzo due to her long time employment with the office. [redacted] however, he does not know. During a recent conversation between [redacted] and Commissioner Sutker on [redacted] the two discussed a variety of issues but did not mention the name [redacted]. [redacted] added that he does not recall [redacted] name coming up in any other conversation with Commissioner Sutker.

b6
b7CInvestigation on 04/12/2000 at Chicago, IllinoisFile # 194P CC 110662 202 - 44 Date dictated 04/12/2000by SA [redacted]
SA [redacted]b6
b7C

194B-CG-110663-302

Continuation of FD-302 of [REDACTED]

, On 04/12/2000 , Page 2

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] described the largest portion of the [REDACTED] and indicated he would be surprised that someone other than a salaried employee would be assigned to perform any work within the [REDACTED]

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] stressed that [REDACTED] adheres to a general chain of command structure which provides him with notification from either the commissioners themselves, their staff, or [REDACTED] employees when a commissioner's office is involved in specific projects or assignments which affect the [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] indicated that any direct contact with individual commissioners or their staff is handled [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] stated that he rarely deals with commissioner's staffs and indicated that [REDACTED] employees generally do not deal with commissioner's staffs directly. He noted that occasionally, a personal relationships between [REDACTED] employees and the commissioners or their staffs might circumvent this procedure of directly notifying him. [REDACTED] has no recollection of any notification from any commissioner's office or any [REDACTED] staff employee [REDACTED].

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] stated that this included anything on the [REDACTED] or at the [REDACTED]. Specifically, [REDACTED] was not familiar with any project, study or other work that a [REDACTED].

[REDACTED] indicated that the [REDACTED] and the [REDACTED] but are not run by the [REDACTED] offered the [REDACTED].

[REDACTED] respectively, as [REDACTED] concerning these areas.

[REDACTED] indicated that he would recall [REDACTED]

b6
b7C

194B-CG-110663-302

Continuation of FD-302 of [REDACTED]

, On 04/12/2000 , Page 3

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] indicated that he does receive quite a bit of correspondence on the [REDACTED] some of which is from the County Commissioners, but indicated that he does not recall any in specific from Sutker. [REDACTED] stated that he would be surprised if Sutker had written more than one letter dealing with the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] offered to have [REDACTED] check all correspondences received from Commissioner Sutker's office to verify whether notification was ever provided.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] has ever informed [REDACTED] that [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Sutker explained that [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Finally, [REDACTED] said that the individual [REDACTED] whom he did not identify by name, would have certainly alerted him that a [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] If [REDACTED] had been notified, he would have followed up with the commissioner after the [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] However [REDACTED] said that he would not be notified if a commissioner's staff member simply came to the [REDACTED] paid for and [REDACTED] without mention of the [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] indicated that Sutker had never indicated to him [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

b6
b7C

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] discussions with the commissioners. He mentioned that the [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] is involved in a [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

b6
b7C

194B-CG-110663-302

Continuation of FD-302 of [REDACTED], On 04/12/2000, Page 4

b6
b7c

[REDACTED] mentioned that Commissioner Sutker's [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] met
[REDACTED] several years ago during the [REDACTED] formation and stressed
that he currently enjoys a "one to one" relationship with her.
Similarly, he doesn't recall [REDACTED] ever mentioning to him any
project or work being done by [REDACTED]
Commissioner Sutker's [REDACTED]

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 03/25/2000

[redacted] previously interviewed was interviewed in the office of his attorney, [redacted] [redacted] was present during portions of the interview. After being advised of the identity of the interviewing agent and the purpose of the interview, [redacted] provided the following information:

b6
b7C
b7D

[redacted] stated that he had reviewed all of the [redacted] [redacted] that he had provided pursuant to a federal grand jury subpoena and he was not aware of [redacted]

b6
b7C
b7D

[redacted]

[redacted] stated that he had [redacted]

b6
b7C
b7D

[redacted]

[redacted] stated that he was familiar with the name [redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted] stated that he had reviewed the [redacted] and did not find anything that [redacted] [redacted] stated that he had [redacted]

b6
b7C
b7DInvestigation on 03/24/2000 at Chicago, IllinoisFile # 194B-CG-110663-302 ⁴⁵ Date dictated 03/25/2000by SA [redacted] :rpw ^{RW}b6
b7C

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 04/22/2000

[redacted]
[redacted] telephone [redacted]
[redacted] was interviewed at her place of employment. After being advised of the identity of the interviewing agent and the purpose of the interview, [redacted] provided the following information:

b6
b7C

[redacted]

b6
b7C

[redacted] indicated that she had been involved in [redacted] since the early 1990s and learned of the [redacted] [redacted] indicated that [redacted] Commissioner CALVIN SUTKER [redacted] [redacted] stated that she had no prior relationship or dealing with SUTKER at that time and

b6
b7CInvestigation on 04/19/2000 at Skokie, IllinoisFile # 194B-CG-110663-302 -46 Date dictated 04/22/2000by SA [redacted] rpw *RPW*b6
b7C

194B-CG-110663-302

Continuation of FD-302 of [REDACTED], On 04/19/2000, Page 2

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] had not met him. [REDACTED] stated that she met with SUTKER a short time later and SUTKER [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] indicated that the [REDACTED] began meeting in March or April, 1997. [REDACTED] stated that the appointments were for three year terms and stated that SUTKER [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] indicated that [REDACTED] she had met with SUTKER periodically in order to [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] estimated that she had met with SUTKER in person six (6) times and talked to him on the telephone approximately 4-6 times. [REDACTED] indicated that she had also sent SUTKER [REDACTED]

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] stated that she initially [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] SUTKER's staff, BARBARA PANOZZO [REDACTED] in her capacity as a SUTKER's [REDACTED] [REDACTED] stated that she had spoken to BARBARA PANOZZO approximately three (3) times regarding SUTKER's schedule and once or twice regarding [REDACTED] matters, including the [REDACTED]

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] indicated that she had worked with [REDACTED] on a number of matters. [REDACTED] indicated that [REDACTED] [REDACTED] indicated that she and [REDACTED]

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] indicated that she was also aware that SUTKER had [REDACTED] [REDACTED] stated that it used to be a female named [REDACTED] but now it was another female she did not know. [REDACTED] indicated that BARBARA PANOZZO [REDACTED] answered the telephone on occasion.

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] indicated that the only issue she could recall working with SUTKER and his staff on other than regular [REDACTED]

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] indicated that she had testified as a [REDACTED]

194B-CG-110663-302

Continuation of FD-302 of [REDACTED]

, On 04/19/2000, Page 3

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] indicated that she spoken to BARBARA PANOZZO [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] and SUTKER had later contacted her about
obtaining some of the information she had used in [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] stated that SUTKER [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] indicated that in her dealings with Commissioner
SUTKER she had never met, worked with, or heard the name [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] mentioned by SUTKER [REDACTED] BARBARA PANOZZO.
[REDACTED] advised that she was aware that an investigation into's [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] SUTKER was taking place from newspaper
articles, but she had not discussed the matter with anyone from
SUTKER's office or been contacted.

b6
b7C

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 05/05/2000

[redacted] telephone [redacted] was interviewed at his place of employment. After being advised of the identity of the interviewing agent and the purpose of the interview, [redacted] provided the following information:

b6
b7C

[redacted] indicated that he did not know anyone named [redacted] Cook County Commissioner CALVIN SUTKER's office and was not aware of [redacted] or anyone else from SUTKER's staff working on any projects directly relating to the [redacted] [redacted] advised that [redacted] had its own staff and volunteers and did not have anyone from SUTKER's or any other Commissioner's office working there.

b6
b7C

[redacted] indicated that in his position [redacted] he had come to know Cook County Commissioner CALVIN SUTKER. [redacted] stated that he did not have a lot of contact with SUTKER or any other Commissioner. [redacted] stated that during 1999, he recalled [redacted] SUTKER [redacted] at SUTKER's request, but nothing else involving SUTKER individually or his office. [redacted] indicated that [redacted] [redacted] has more direct contact with Public Officials than he does and might work with SUTKER on matters concerning [redacted]

b6
b7C

[redacted] stated that the he and others at [redacted] dealt with the [redacted]

b6
b7C

[redacted] indicated that [redacted] sent a representative to these countywide hearings, but he was unsure who. [redacted] indicated that [redacted]

[redacted] indicated that he did not know if anyone from SUTKER's staff had worked on either of these matters.

[redacted] stated that [redacted] has historically been free from the [redacted] that is commonplace throughout Chicago area politics and [redacted]

b6
b7CInvestigation on 05/05/2000 at [redacted]File # 194B-CG-110663-302 -47Date dictated 05/05/2000by SA [redacted] :rpw *RW*b6
b7C

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 05/09/2000

[redacted] date of birth [redacted]
[redacted] telephone [redacted] was
interviewed at his place of employment [redacted]

b6
b7C

[redacted] telephone [redacted]
[redacted] After being advised of the identity of the
interviewing agents and the purpose of the interview, [redacted]
provided the following information:

[redacted] indicated that he had [redacted]
for Cook County Commissioner CALVIN SUTKER for approximately a
[redacted] indicated that he had
been a [redacted]

b6
b7C

SUTKER's [redacted]

[redacted] indicated that he knows [redacted] and is
aware that [redacted]

b6
b7CInvestigation on 05/09/2000 at Chicago, IllinoisFile # 194B-CG-110663-302 - 48 Date dictated 05/09/2000by SA [redacted] rpw
SA [redacted] WJPb6
b7C

194B-CG-110663-302

Continuation of FD-302 of [REDACTED], On 05/09/2000, Page 2

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] BARBARA PANOZZO [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] BARBARA PANOZZO [REDACTED] indicated that he [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] stated that he talked to BARBARA PANOZZO [REDACTED] and that they usually talked about [REDACTED] not SUTKER's office in specific. [REDACTED] stated that he had talked to both SUTKER and BARBARA PANOZZO after reading about the investigation [REDACTED] in the Chicago Tribune. [REDACTED] stated that they did not tell him about anything that [REDACTED] SUTKER. [REDACTED]

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] indicated that he did not talk to SUTKER or BARBARA PANOZZO about the investigation after he initially heard about it except that [REDACTED] SUTKER's [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] SUTKER [REDACTED] explained that SUTKER [REDACTED] SUTKER was under investigation. [REDACTED] indicated that he had not been contacted by SUTKER, BARBARA PANOZZO [REDACTED] about the investigation and he really only knew what he had read in the paper. [REDACTED] indicated that the investigation surprised him because he believed that SUTKER and the PANOZZOs were honest people of good character. [REDACTED] indicated that he still believed this to be true.

[REDACTED] indicated that he knew SUTKER [REDACTED] and had some general conversations with him, but [REDACTED] indicated that they were not close and did not speak with any regularity or frequency.

b6
b7C

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 05/05/2000

[redacted] telephone [redacted]
[redacted] was interviewed at her place of employment. After being advised of the identity of the interviewing agent and the purpose of the interview, [redacted] provided the following information:

[redacted] advised that as the [redacted] she has some contact with the [redacted] indicated that the [redacted] that meets periodically. [redacted] indicated that Commissioner [redacted] CALVIN SUTKER [redacted] were among those on the [redacted] stated that [redacted] [redacted] indicated that the [redacted] is managed by the [redacted]

[redacted] advised that she knows Cook County Commissioner CALVIN SUTKER because he is a member of the [redacted] [redacted] but does not speak to him regularly. [redacted] indicated that she sees SUTKER at the [redacted] and indicated that his attendance is good [redacted] indicated that she does not usually have any dealing with individual Commissioner's staff and did not recall any specific contact or dealings with anyone on SUTKER's staff from 1999 to the present other than seeing them at [redacted] [redacted] indicated that she had not been contacted by SUTKER about any work his staff was doing relating to the [redacted] indicated that she did not know or have any contact with anyone on SUTKER's staff. [redacted] indicated that [redacted] met at the [redacted] once during the [redacted] and the Commissioners brought people with them to set up for the meeting and keep notes on the meeting, but [redacted] did not recall if SUTKER brought anyone with him.

[redacted] indicated that she does not recognize the name [redacted] and no one by that name had ever worked at the [redacted] advised that she had spoken to her human resources department and ascertained that no one using that name had been employed by [redacted] advised that it would be unusual for a Commissioner's staff member to be working at the [redacted] because she

Investigation on 05/05/2000 at [redacted]
File # 194B-CG-110663-302 - 4/9 Date dictated 05/05/2000
by SA [redacted] :rpw *RPW*

194B-CG-110663-302

Continuation of FD-302 of [REDACTED], On 05/05/2000, Page 2 b6 b7C

has her own staff. [REDACTED] indicated that she was not aware of a Commissioner's staff member working [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] stated that the [REDACTED] was always involved in [REDACTED] indicated that if an individual Commissioner's office was involved with such a [REDACTED] would most likely have handled setting it up and dealing with the Commissioner.

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 05/12/2000

[redacted]
[redacted] telephone [redacted]
[redacted] was interviewed telephonically. After being advised of the identity of the interviewing agent and the purpose of the interview, [redacted] provided the following information:

b6
b7C

[redacted] indicated that she had spoken to the [redacted] and [redacted] and they had both confirmed that they had not had any dealings with Cook County Commissioner CALVIN SUTKER or anyone on his staff during 1999 about any work SUTKER or the Cook County Board of Commissioners was doing relating to [redacted] indicated that neither man recognized the name [redacted] as anyone from SUTKER's staff or anyone they had ever had any dealings with.

b6
b7C

[redacted] indicated that she and [redacted] [redacted] had confirmed with [redacted] personnel department that no one by the name [redacted] had ever worked at the [redacted] as an employee, volunteer, or in any other capacity as far as their records were concerned.

b6
b7CInvestigation on 05/12/2000 at Chicago, Illinois (telephonically)File # 194B-CG-110663-302-50 Date dictated 05/12/2000by SA [redacted]:rpwb6
b7C

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 05/12/2000

[redacted]
[redacted] telephone [redacted]
[redacted] was interviewed telephonically at her place of employment. After being advised of the identity of the interviewing agent and the purpose of the interview, [redacted] provided the following information:

b6
b7C

[redacted] advised that as the [redacted]
[redacted] she had sporadic contact with various Cook County Commissioners. [redacted] has been with [redacted] since [redacted] and explained that she attended [redacted] [redacted] once or twice a month, went to [redacted] and occasionally spoke to a Commissioner. [redacted] stated that she generally deals with [redacted] who is the [redacted]
[redacted]
[redacted]

b6
b7C

[redacted] stated that the [redacted]
[redacted]

b6
b7C

[redacted] stated that she does not recall any specific dealings that she has had with Cook County Commissioner CALVIN SUTKER or anyone on his staff. [redacted] stated that she does not know anyone from SUTKER's staff. [redacted] related that she does not know [redacted] or recognize his name as someone she had any dealings with. [redacted] advised that she is not aware of SUTKER or anyone from his office contacting the [redacted] about any [redacted] or any other matters his office was involved with relating to the [redacted] [redacted] advised that her counterpart at the [redacted] [redacted] might have some knowledge as to any such [redacted] in SUTKER's office.

b6
b7CInvestigation on 05/11/2000 at [redacted] (telephonically)File # 194B-CG-110663-302-50 Date dictated 05/12/2000by SA [redacted]:rpw *RPW*b6
b7C

194B-CG-110663-302

Continuation of FD-302 of [REDACTED], On 05/11/2000, Page 2

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] reviewed her file on SUTKER and related that she had located two items. First, a [REDACTED] she sent to SUTKER along with a [REDACTED] to the [REDACTED] stated that these [REDACTED] were sent to all of the Commissioners. [REDACTED] stated that she also had a newspaper article concerning SUTKER and the NORTH SHORE MOSQUITO ABATEMENT DISTRICT. [REDACTED] stated that she did not have anything else and did not recall any other meetings with SUTKER or anyone on his staff during late 1998 or anytime during 1999.

[REDACTED] advised that the [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] might have had some dealings with SUTKER [REDACTED] or someone from SUTKER's staff. [REDACTED] advised that both [REDACTED] who had existing relationships with individual commissioners. [REDACTED] advised the individual commissioners would sometimes contact [REDACTED] directly about matters due to these existing relationships. [REDACTED] advised that she was not aware of SUTKER having contacted with [REDACTED]

b6
b7C

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 05/10/2000

[redacted]
[redacted]
[redacted] telephone [redacted] was interviewed telephonically at her place of employment. After being advised of the identity of the interviewing agent and the purpose of the interview, [redacted] provided the following information:

b6
b7C

[redacted] stated that as the [redacted]
[redacted]

b6
b7C

[redacted] stated that she did not work a lot with individual Cook County Commissioners or other public officials except at the [redacted] level. [redacted] explained that if an individual Commissioner or other public official was involved in a [redacted] she might have contact with them. [redacted] related that most of her contact with Cook County Commissioners was simply attending [redacted]

b6
b7C

[redacted] indicated that her only direct contact with Cook County Commissioner CALVIN SUTKER in 1999 was at a meeting that SUTKER [redacted]
[redacted] SUTKER, [redacted] SUTKER
[redacted] she later identified as [redacted] after checking her calendar. [redacted] stated that the meeting lasted about one and one-half hours.

b6
b7C

[redacted] indicated that she got the impression from the meeting that SUTKER was a big supporter of public education. [redacted] stated that SUTKER [redacted]
[redacted] stated that SUTKER [redacted] had indicated that [redacted]
[redacted] stated that shortly after the meeting, she and [redacted] provided SUTKER's office with [redacted]
[redacted] stated that she never spoke to SUTKER [redacted] or anyone else on [redacted]

b6
b7C

Investigation on 05/09/2000 at [redacted] (telephonically)

File # 194B-CG-110663-302 ⁵² Date dictated 05/10/2000

by SA [redacted] rpw

b6
b7C

194B-CG-110663-302

Continuation of FD-302 of [REDACTED], On 05/09/2000, Page 2

b6
b7C

SUTKER's staff after the meeting. [REDACTED] stated that she never worked with [REDACTED] on any [REDACTED] and was not aware that one was ever established.

After the interview, [REDACTED] faxed that interviewing agent a letter indicating that a review of her calendar had revealed that the meeting between herself, [REDACTED] SUTKER, and [REDACTED] had taken place on [REDACTED] at 10:00 a.m. [REDACTED] also faxed a [REDACTED] letter from [REDACTED] addressed to SUTKER's office, which included a [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] These documents were placed into a 1A envelope for future retrieval.

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 05/10/2000

[redacted]
[redacted]
[redacted] telephone [redacted] was interviewed telephonically at his place of employment. After being advised of the identity of the interviewing agent and the purpose of the interview, [redacted] provided the following information:

b6
b7C

[redacted] indicated that as [redacted]
[redacted]
[redacted] explained that [redacted] is owned by the
[redacted] but run by the [redacted]
[redacted] stated that he also oversees [redacted]
[redacted] and puts out annual information on the [redacted]

b6
b7C

[redacted] stated that he was contacted in early 1999 by Cook County Commissioner CALVIN SUTKER and subsequently had a meeting with SUTKER [redacted]

b6
b7C

[redacted] related that the purpose of the meeting was for SUTKER to introduce [redacted] SUTKER [redacted]
[redacted]

[redacted] indicated that the meeting lasted approximately ninety (90) minutes.

[redacted] stated that at the meeting SUTKER introduced [redacted]
[redacted]

b6
b7C

[redacted] stated that he never spoke to or worked with [redacted] after that.

[redacted] stated that he speaks to SUTKER regularly and sees him at [redacted] stated that he spoke to SUTKER as recently as [redacted] indicated that he knew BARBARA PANOZZO from SUTKER's staff and had discussed [redacted] business with her. [redacted] indicated that he never discussed with SUTKER or anyone else on SUTKER's staff anything else that [redacted] had worked on and he was not aware of anything that [redacted] had worked on for SUTKER [redacted] did not recall [redacted] attending any [redacted]

b6
b7C

Investigation on 05/09/2000 at [redacted] (telephonically)

File # 194B-CG-110663-302 -53 Date dictated 05/10/2000

by SA [redacted] :rpw ^{rw}

b6
b7C

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 05/09/2000

[redacted] date of birth [redacted]
[redacted] telephone [redacted] was
interviewed telephonically at his place of employment, [redacted]
[redacted]
telephone [redacted] After being advised of the identity of
the interviewing agent and the purpose of the interview, [redacted]
provided the following information:

[redacted] indicated that he was aware that [redacted]

[redacted]

b6
b7Cb6
b7C

Investigation on 05/09/2000 at Chicago, Illinois (telephonically)

File # 194B-CG-110663-302 -54 Date dictated 05/09/2000

by SA [redacted] *RAV*

b6
b7C

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 05/17/2000

[redacted] telephone [redacted] was interviewed after contacting the interviewing agent telephonically. After being advised of the identity of the interviewing agent and the purpose of the interview, [redacted] provided the following information:

[redacted] indicated that in the past few years, she had periodically met with Cook County Commissioner CALVIN SUTKER about the possibility of [redacted]

[redacted] advised that she had never worked with, had a conversation with, or met anyone else on SUTKER's staff. [redacted] indicated that she did not know anyone named [redacted] SUTKER [redacted] and was not aware of [redacted] SUTKER [redacted]

[redacted] telephone [redacted]

[redacted] advised that she had actively worked at the [redacted] [redacted] advised that she would be aware if anyone from SUTKER's office was working on matters relating to the [redacted] advised that she had not spoken to SUTKER or anyone on his staff about [redacted]

Investigation on 05/17/2000 at [redacted] (telephonically)

File # 194B-CG-110663-302 -55 Date dictated 05/17/2000

by SA [redacted] rpw *RPW*

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 05/16/2000

[redacted]
[redacted]
telephone [redacted] was interviewed at her place of employment. After being advised of the identity of the interviewing agent and the purpose of the interview, [redacted] provided the following information:

b6
b7C

[redacted] indicated that she had been with the [redacted]
[redacted]
indicated that she started as the [redacted]
[redacted]

b6
b7C

telephone [redacted] explained that the [redacted]
[redacted] had been working together at that time, but began operating separately at that time. [redacted]
[redacted] related that [redacted]
[redacted] and provided the
interviewing agent with a [redacted]
[redacted] which was placed into a 1A envelope for future retrieval.

[redacted] indicated that in all of the time that she had worked at [redacted] she had never met nor worked on any [redacted] related matters with Cook County Commissioner CALVIN SUTKER or anyone from his staff. [redacted] indicated that she knew of SUTKER and indicated that he had worked on the possibility of [redacted]
[redacted]

b6
b7C

[redacted] provided the interviewing agent with copies of four pieces of correspondence [redacted] to SUTKER on this matter as well as [redacted]
[redacted] indicated that both [redacted] telephone [redacted] and [redacted] worked with SUTKER on this matter. The [redacted] were placed in a 1A envelope for future retrieval.

[redacted] indicated that she was not aware of any other [redacted]
[redacted] dealings with SUTKER since that time, but recalled [redacted]

b6
b7C

Investigation on 05/15/2000 at [redacted]
File # 194B-CG-110663-302 ⁻⁵⁶ Date dictated 05/16/2000
by SA [redacted]:rpw ^{RW}

b6
b7C

194B-CG-110663-302

Continuation of FD-302 of [REDACTED]

, On 05/15/2000, Page 2

b6
b7C

attempting to set up a lunch meeting with SUTKER at one time. [REDACTED] stated that she does not recall the meeting ever taking place. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] may have had some dealings with SUTKER that she was unaware of. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] had two administrative assistants [REDACTED] who worked on matters with [REDACTED] while she was employed by the [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] indicated that she did not recognize the name [REDACTED] and stated that he had not done any work for SUTKER relating to the [REDACTED] in the time that she had been employed there. [REDACTED] indicated that any involvement with SUTKER and his staff relating to [REDACTED] [REDACTED] would have come through her. [REDACTED] stated that no one else in her office would have handled these matters since she had become [REDACTED]

b6
b7C

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 05/16/2000

[redacted]
[redacted] telephone [redacted] was interviewed at his place of employment. After being advised of the identity of the interviewing agent and the purpose of the interview, [redacted] provided the following information:

b6
b7C

[redacted] indicated that [redacted]
[redacted]

b6
b7C

[redacted] indicated that when he was served with a Grand Jury subpoena requesting [redacted]
[redacted]

b3

them pursuant to the subpoena.

Investigation on 05/15/2000 at Chicago, Illinois (telephonically)

File # 194B-CG-110663-302 -57 Date dictated 05/16/2000

by SA [redacted]:rpw RFW

b6
b7C

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 05/19/2000

[redacted] white, male, date of birth [redacted]
[redacted] telephone number [redacted] was interviewed at his
place of employment the [redacted]

[redacted] telephone number [redacted]
[redacted] After being advised of the identity of the interviewing
agents and the purpose of the interview, [redacted] provided the
following information:

[redacted] stated that he began working for [redacted]

[redacted]

b6
b7C
b7Db6
b7C
b7DInvestigation on 05/19/2000 at Chicago, IllinoisFile # 194B-CG-110663-302-58 Date dictated 05/19/2000by SA [redacted] erpw ATWb6
b7C

194B-CG-110663-302

Continuation of FD-302 of [REDACTED]

, On 05/19/2000, Page 4

b6
b7C
b7D

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] stated that he did not know if [REDACTED] did any political work [REDACTED] SUTKER. [REDACTED] stated that he knew that the PANOZZO family was heavily involved in politics, but stated that he did not know the specifics because he was not heavily involved in politics.

[REDACTED] stated that he had not spoken to SUTKER or anyone from SUTKER's office about the investigation involving [REDACTED] SUTKER's office. [REDACTED] acknowledged that when he first read about it in the newspaper, he called SUTKER [REDACTED] SUTKER [REDACTED] advised that SUTKER never called him back. [REDACTED] advised that the only other time he had spoken to SUTKER was once when he ran into him at the [REDACTED] indicated that he told SUTKER that they [REDACTED] time and the conversation ended.

b6
b7C
b7D

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 05/25/2000

[redacted] previously interviewed, was interviewed at the Dirksen Federal Building, 219 South Dearborn, 16th Floor, Chicago, Illinois. After being advised of the identity of the interviewing agent and the purpose of the interview, [redacted] provided the following information:

b6
b7C

[redacted] stated that when he [redacted] he was not really sure what [redacted] did for a living, but [redacted] knew that [redacted] began working for [redacted]

b6
b7C

[redacted] indicated that he later learned that [redacted]

[redacted] CALVIN SUTKER [redacted]

SUTKER [redacted]

[redacted] indicated that he always left for work

b6
b7C

[redacted] indicated that in the time that [redacted]

b6
b7C

Investigation on 05/25/2000 at Chicago, Illinois

File # 194B-CG-110663-302 ⁻⁵⁹ Date dictated 05/25/2000

by SA [redacted]:rpw^{RPW}

b6
b7C

194B-CG-110663-302

Continuation of FD-302 of [REDACTED], On 05/25/2000, Page 2

[REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] was aware that he [REDACTED] had received a Grand Jury Subpoena [REDACTED] indicated that he and [REDACTED] had not discussed the details of anything relating to [REDACTED] SUTKER or the any F.B.I. investigation into that employment, except that [REDACTED] had told him that there was an investigation into [REDACTED] SUTKER. [REDACTED] indicated that [REDACTED] lawyer had also advised him to tell the truth about what he knew after he told them he got the subpoena.

b3

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 05/18/2000

[redacted] white, male, date of birth [redacted] telephone [redacted]
[redacted] was interviewed at approximately [redacted]
[redacted] After being advised of the identity
of the interviewing agent and the purpose of the interview,
[redacted] provided the following information:

b6
b7C

[redacted] stated that he currently resides with
[redacted] (hereinafter [redacted] at the above-referenced
address. [redacted] stated that [redacted]

b6
b7C

[redacted]

[redacted] stated that at the time [redacted]

[redacted]

b6
b7CInvestigation on 05/18/2000 at Chicago, IllinoisFile # 194B-CG-110663-302 - 60 Date dictated 05/18/2000by SA [redacted] .rpw
[redacted] WTPb6
b7C

194B-CG-110663-302

Continuation of FD-302 of

[Redacted]

, On 05/18/2000, Page 2

b6
b7C

[Redacted]

[Redacted] provided the interviewing agents with a copy of his Illinois Driver's license listing the following identifiers:

NAME:
Address:

[Redacted]

Race: White
Sex: Male
Height:
Weight:

[Redacted]

b6
b7C

194B-CG-110663-302

Continuation of FD-302 of [REDACTED], On 05/18/2000, Page 3

DOB:

OLN:

[REDACTED]

b3
b6
b7C

At the conclusion of the interview, [REDACTED] was provided with United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois Grand Jury Subpoena commanding his appearance on [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 05/31/2000

[redacted]
[redacted] was interviewed at his place of employment, [redacted]
[redacted] After being
advised of the identity of the interviewing agent and the purpose
of the interview, [redacted] provided the following information:

b6
b7C

[redacted] stated that he was [redacted]

b6
b7C

[Large redacted area]

Investigation on 05/30/2000 at [redacted]
File # 194B-CG-110663-302-61 Date dictated 05/31/2000
by SA [redacted] rpw *RPW*

b6
b7C

194B-CG-110663-302

Continuation of FD-302 of [REDACTED], On 05/30/2000, Page 2

b6
b7C

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] stated that he did not see [REDACTED] a lot when [REDACTED] because they were usually at [REDACTED]. He indicated that he did see [REDACTED] sometimes if they ended up at [REDACTED] stated that during that time, [REDACTED] was usually at [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] stated that he saw [REDACTED] a great deal more after [REDACTED] was assigned to the [REDACTED] office. [REDACTED] explained that this was because his [REDACTED] office had been at the [REDACTED] until a few weeks before the date of the interview. [REDACTED] stated that when they talked, it was usually either about [REDACTED] or small talk about sports or events in the news.

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] never told him that he was [REDACTED].

[REDACTED] stated that the [REDACTED] was a very political office and he thought it best not to discuss politics with people at work, so he never asked [REDACTED] indicated that the [REDACTED] might have a better idea about any other employment that [REDACTED] had when he was initially hired, because they saw him a great deal more than he did.

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] indicated that the [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] stated that the he had read an article about a federal investigation involving [REDACTED] but he did not recall the details of the article. [REDACTED] stated that he had never discussed the federal investigation or the article with [REDACTED]

b6
b7C

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 06/26/2000

[redacted]
[redacted] telephone [redacted]
was interviewed telephonically at her place of employment. After being advised of the identity of the interviewing agent and the purpose of the interview, [redacted] provided the following information:

b6
b7C

[redacted] advised that Cook County received approximately
[redacted]

b6
b7C

[redacted] advised that in order to receive this [redacted]
[redacted]

b6
b7C

Investigation on 06/26/2000 at Chicago, Illinois (telephonically)

File # 194B-CG-110663-302 *bd* Date dictated 06/26/2000

by SA [redacted] *rpw* *RPW*

b6
b7C

194B-CG-110663-302-62

194B-CG-110663-302

RPW:rpw/pw

The following investigation was conducted On July 19, 2000,
by Special Agent (SA) [REDACTED] FEDERAL BUREAU OF
INVESTIGATION (FBI), Chicago, Illinois:

SA [REDACTED] reviewed [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] The
review of the [REDACTED] revealed no negative information on
[REDACTED]

b6
b7C

b3

194B-CG-110663-302-63
100/pw

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 07/19/2000

[redacted] white, female, [redacted]
[redacted] telephone [redacted] was
interviewed at her place of employment. After being advised of
the identity of the interviewing agent and the purpose of the
interview, [redacted] provided the following information:

[redacted]

[redacted]

At the conclusion of the interview, [redacted] provided the
interviewing agent with [redacted]

[redacted] pursuant to a Federal Grand Jury
Subpoena, Northern District of Illinois. [redacted] were
placed into a 1A envelope for future retrieval.

Investigation on 07/19/2000 at Chicago, Illinois

File # 194B-CG-110663-302 ⁶⁴ Date dictated 07/19/2000

by SA [redacted] rpw ^{RM}

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 08/03/2000

[redacted] telephone [redacted]
[redacted] was interviewed at his place of employment. After being advised of the identity of the interviewing agents and the purpose of the interview, [redacted] provided the following information:

b6
b7C

[redacted] stated that [redacted] (hereinafter [redacted]) had used temporary laborers from [redacted] (hereinafter [redacted]) until approximately [redacted] stated that he had been in his current position since [redacted] and related that [redacted] had used [redacted] employees for the entire eleven months from [redacted] stated that he would have to check his records to see how far back [redacted] had used [redacted] employees before [redacted]

b6
b7C

[redacted] stated that [redacted] bringing in temporary labor to assist [redacted] stated that the [redacted] were primarily used to [redacted] as well as [redacted] [redacted] stated that [redacted] employees would occasionally do some [redacted] and area surrounding the [redacted] indicated that he had never used [redacted] to do any clerical work of any kind.

b6
b7C

[redacted] estimated that he normally used approximately 2-3 [redacted] employees for a few days each month, but stated that he had some projects where he used 2-4 employees for periods of one week to three weeks. [redacted] stated that there was no contracts or paperwork from [redacted] except weekly invoices documenting the hours that the employees had worked and the amount due. [redacted] stated that whenever he needed [redacted] workers, he would contact a male, FNU LNU, and simply request a certain number of workers and approximate how long he would need them. [redacted] stated that [redacted] for temporary laborers.

b6
b7C

At the conclusion of the interview, [redacted] checked the [redacted] computer records and indicated that they had records of doing business with [redacted] going back to 1994.

b6
b7CInvestigation on 08/02/2000 at Chicago, IllinoisFile # 194B-CG-110663-302-65 Date dictated 08/03/2000SA [redacted]
by SA [redacted] :rpwb6
b7C

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 08/03/2000

[redacted] previously interviewed was interviewed at [redacted]
[redacted]
After being advised of the identity of the interviewing agent and the purpose of the interview, [redacted] provided the following information after reviewing two lists of phone numbers, one of which included subscriber information:

[redacted]

b6
b7C
b7Db6
b7C
b7DInvestigation on 08/02/2000 at Chicago, IllinoisFile # 194B-CG-110663-302 *66* Date dictated 08/03/2000by SA [redacted] *rpw*b6
b7C

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 08/04/2000

[redacted]
[redacted]
telephone [redacted] was interviewed at her place of
employment. After being advised of the identity of the
interviewing agents and the purpose of the interview, [redacted]
provided the following information:

[redacted]

b6
b7Cb6
b7CInvestigation on 08/04/2000 at Chicago, IllinoisFile # 194B-CG-110663-302 ⁻⁶⁷ Date dictated 08/04/2000by SA [redacted] : rpw
SA [redacted] WJPb6
b7C

194B-CG-110663-302

Continuation of FD-302 of , On 08/04/2000, Page 2

b6
b7C

At the conclusion of the interview, was served with and accepted a Federal Grand Jury Subpoena, Northern District of Illinois,
 was advised that she would be contacted if her appearance was required on that date.

b3

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 08/15/2000

[redacted] previously interviewed, was interviewed telephonically on August 14, 2000, at his place of employment. After being advised of the identity of the interviewing agent and the purpose of the interview, [redacted] provided the following information:

b6
b7Cb6
b7CInvestigation on 08/14/2000 at Chicago, Illinois (telephonically)File # 194B-CG-110663-302-68 Date dictated 08/15/2000by SA [redacted]:rpw *RPW*b6
b7C

194B-CG-110663-302 -69
RPW:rpw *rw*

On September 20, 2000, [redacted] previously
interviewed, contacted SA [redacted] Federal Bureau of
Investigation, and advised that he would be [redacted]

[redacted]

b6
b7C
b7D

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 10/18/2000

[redacted] previously interviewed, was interviewed after he voluntarily appeared in the Chicago Office of the United States Attorney, 219 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois. Also present during the interview was Assistant United States Attorney (AUSA) [redacted]. After being advised of the identity of the interviewing agent and the purpose of the interview, [redacted] provided the following information:

b3

b3

Investigation on 10/17/2000 at Chicago, IllinoisFile # 194B-CG-110663-302 - 70 Date dictated 10/18/2000by SA [redacted] :rpw ²⁰⁰b6
b7C

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 10/23/2000

[redacted]
[redacted]
[redacted] telephone [redacted] was interviewed voluntarily at his place of business. Also present during portions of the interview was [redacted]. After being advised of the identity of the interviewing agents and the purpose of the interview, [redacted] provided the following information, at times after consulting with or adopting statements made by [redacted]

b6
b7C

[redacted] indicated that he was aware that an amendment to a budget he had proposed to the Board of Commissioners a few years ago had given each of the Commissioners an additional position in their offices. [redacted] stated that he was aware that each commissioner could use the funding for the additional position to hire independent contractors rather than a permanent county employee. [redacted] related that [redacted]

b6
b7C

[redacted] called in [redacted] and instructed [redacted] to locate the amendment.

[redacted] returned with several sheets of paper labeled "FY 1997 Amendment No. 75" and indicated that the documents represented the original budget amendment creating the position. [redacted] indicated that [redacted] had talked to many of the [redacted] Commissioners about adding the position. [redacted] related that the initial proposal did not give the commissioners discretion to fill the position with independent contractors, but only allowed for an additional permanent county employee position. [redacted] identified the accounts on the above-referenced amendment as follows:

b6
b7C

Account #110 - Salaries and Wages of Regular Employees
Account #130 - Salaries and Wages of Extra Employees
Account #289 - Technical Services Not Otherwise
Classified

[redacted] identified the "110 account" as the "permanent employee" account, the "130 account" as the "temporary employee" account, and the "289 account" as the "independent contractor" account.

b6
b7C

Investigation on 10/23/2000 at Chicago, Illinois

File # 194B-CG-110663-302-71 Date dictated 10/23/2000

by SA [redacted] row
SA [redacted] WTP

b6
b7C

194B-CG-110663-302

Continuation of FD-302 of [redacted], On 10/23/2000, Page 2 b6 b7C

[redacted] pointed out that he had [redacted] on the amendment [redacted] explained that he did not think that adding another position was warranted at the time, but he could not recall the details of why. [redacted] stated that he sometimes [redacted] certain amendments for political reasons. [redacted] explained that [redacted]

b6
b7C

[redacted] stated that he was not aware of any specific Cook County written policy or rule that limited the nature of the work that independent contractors could perform. [redacted] indicated that there might be some limiting policy, but he would have to look into it. [redacted] stated that the amendment would have come from the Board of Commissioner's Finance Committee and then to the full Board of Commissioners, but could not recall the discussion on the amendment.

b6
b7C

[redacted] stated that he was already [redacted] when the Amendment passed, so [redacted] stated that he had [redacted] but stated that it was not pursuant to the same budget amendment. [redacted] stated that it was his experience that independent contractors were hired to work on specific projects rather than just being hired to work on whatever came up. [redacted] explained that he would expect permanent County employees rather than independent contractors to work on such matters.

b6
b7C

[redacted] stated that he recognized the name [redacted] BARBARA PANOZZO [redacted] indicated that he knew BARBARA PANOZZO and knew that she had worked for SUTKER for some time. [redacted] indicated that he could not necessarily distinguish between BARBARA PANOZZO [redacted] but stated that he thought that [redacted] [redacted] stated that he knew SUTKER was close to [redacted] and that SUTKER and BARBARA PANOZZO had worked together for a long time.

b6
b7C

[redacted] stated that he was not aware that [redacted] was, or was supposed to be, [redacted] SUTKER, until he saw newspaper reports about a federal investigation into SUTKER's office. [redacted] stated that

b6
b7C

194B-CG-110663-302

Continuation of FD-302 of [redacted], On 10/23/2000, Page 3

he had never received a complaint or allegation that [redacted] SUTKER's office. [redacted] stated that he had never dealt with or worked with [redacted] in his [redacted] did not recall seeing a [redacted] SUTKER [redacted] and stated that he and SUTKER never discussed the matter.

b6
b7C

[redacted] stated that the Board of Commissioners approved most contracts that were of any significant amount. [redacted] agreed with [redacted] that the Board of Commissioners was not required to approve the contracts of these independent contractors because they had been excepted from the general rule by amendment.

b6
b7C

At the conclusion of the interview, [redacted] provided the interviewing agents with two pieces of paper, dated November 22, 1996, and labeled "FY 1997 Amendment No. 75" and a third sheet of paper (yellow) with handwritten descriptions of accounts 110, 130, and 289. These documents were placed into a 1A envelope for future retrieval.

b6
b7C

AMENDMENT NUMBER 75

Amendment sponsored by Commissioners Lechowicz, Sims, Davis, Moreno, Sutker, Maldonado, Steele, Carr, Fleming and Silvestri. Budgetary Unit: 018 - Office of the County Commissioners. The amendment was moved for approval by Commissioner Lechowicz, seconded by Commissioner Maldonado, and on a voice-vote, the amendment was APPROVED. President Stroger voted present. Commissioner Butler voted nay.

FY 1997 Amendment No. 75

SPONSORS: Commissioners Ted Lechowicz, Allan C. Carr, Danny K. Davis, Barclay Fleming, Joseph Mario Moreno, Peter N. Silvestri, Calvin R. Sutker, Roberto Maldonado, Bobbie L. Steele, Deborah Sims, Carl R. Hansen and Herbert T. Schumann. Jr.

SOURCE OF FUNDING: Increase Revenue Recorder of Deeds

COST OF AMENDMENT: \$0

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENT:

APPROVED: _____

DENIED: _____

WITHDRAWN: _____

Positions may be filled either on the 110, 130 or 289 accounts with transfers between these accounts to be made at the discretion of each Commissioner.

BUDGETARY UNIT: 018-Office of the County Commissioners

| | | | | | | FROM | TO |
|----------------|-----------------|--|---|--------------|--|-------------|-------------|
| VOL. | TAB-PAGE | ITEM(S) | | | | | |
| II | T-8 | Add the following positions: | | | | | |
| ACT/SUB | CODE | JOB TITLE | GRADE | # POS | | | |
| | 0906 | Clerk IV | 009 | 16 | | \$0 | \$302,048 |
| VOL. | TAB-PAGE | ITEM(S) | | | | | |
| II | T-9 | Adjust the following budgetary accounts: | | | | | |
| | | 018-110 | Salaries and Wages of Regular Employees | | | \$3,692,682 | \$3,994,730 |
| | | 018-170 | Mandatory Medicare Costs | | | 47,332 | 51,712 |
| | | 018-175 | Life Insurance Program | | | 11,791 | 12,733 |
| | | 018-176 | Hospitalization Insurance | | | 343,081 | 445,833 |
| | | 018-177 | Dental Insurance Plan | | | 10,457 | 13,433 |
| | | 018-179 | Vision Care Insurance | | | 7,814 | 9,926 |

SPONSORS: Commissioners Ted Lechowicz, Allan C. Carr, Danny K. Davis, Barclay Fleming, Joseph Mario Moreno, Peter N. Silvestri, Calvin R. Sutker, Roberto Maldonado, Bobbie L. Steele, Deborah Sims, Carl R. Hansen and Herbert T. Schumann, Jr.

SOURCE OF FUNDING: Increase Revenue Recorder of Deeds

COST OF AMENDMENT: \$0

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENT:

APPROVED: 

DENIED: _____

WITHDRAWN: _____

Positions may be filled either on the 110, 130 or 289 accounts with transfers between these accounts to be made at the discretion of each Commissioner.

BUDGETARY UNIT: 018-Office of the County Commissioners

| | | | | | | FROM | TO |
|----------------|-----------------|--|---|--------------|--|-------------|-------------|
| <u>VOL.</u> | <u>TAB-PAGE</u> | <u>ITEM(S)</u> | | | | | |
| II | T-8 | Add the following positions: | | | | | |
| <u>ACT/SUB</u> | <u>CODE</u> | <u>JOB TITLE</u> | <u>GRADE</u> | <u># POS</u> | | | |
| | 0906 | Clerk IV | 009 | 16 | | \$0 | \$302,048 |
| <u>VOL.</u> | <u>TAB-PAGE</u> | <u>ITEM(S)</u> | | | | | |
| II | T-9 | Adjust the following budgetary accounts: | | | | | |
| | | 018-110 | Salaries and Wages of Regular Employees | | | \$3,692,682 | \$3,994,730 |
| | | 018-170 | Mandatory Medicare Costs | | | 47,332 | 51,712 |
| | | 018-175 | Life Insurance Program | | | 11,791 | 12,733 |
| | | 018-176 | Hospitalization Insurance | | | 343,081 | 445,833 |
| | | 018-177 | Dental Insurance Plan | | | 10,457 | 13,433 |
| | | 018-179 | Vision Care Insurance | | | 7,814 | 9,926 |

A

Acct #110 Salaries and Wages of Regular Employees

Acct #130 Salaries and Wages Extra Employees

Acct # 289 Technical Services Not Otherwise Classified

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 03/08/2001

[redacted] date of birth [redacted]
social security account [redacted]
[redacted] telephone [redacted] cellular
telephone [redacted] was interviewed at his place of
business, [redacted]
[redacted] telephone [redacted] After
being advised of the identity of the interviewing agents and the
purpose of the interview, [redacted] was provided with two Grand Jury
subpoenas and subsequently provided the following information:

b3

b3

Investigation on 03/07/2001 at [redacted]

b3

File # 194B-CG-110663-302-72 Date dictated 03/08/2001SA [redacted] :rpw
by SA [redacted]b6
b7C

194B-CG-110663-302

Continuation of FD-302 of [REDACTED], On 03/07/2001, Page 2

b3

[REDACTED] inquired about the nature of the investigation and stated that [REDACTED] had not informed him about any investigation that [REDACTED] might be involved in. [REDACTED] stated that he had not read any newspaper articles or otherwise heard about any investigation involving [REDACTED]

b3

[REDACTED] related that he would like to speak to his attorney before [REDACTED] [REDACTED] stated that he understood that privacy statutes did not apply to criminal investigations, but stated that he was concerned about privacy and liability issues [REDACTED]

b3

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 03/26/2001

[redacted], previously interviewed, was interviewed at his place of business, [redacted] telephone [redacted]. After being advised of the identity of the interviewing agents and the purpose of the interview, [redacted] provided the following information:

b6
b7C

[Large redacted area]

b3

At the conclusion of the interview, [redacted] provided the interviewing agent with [redacted] were placed into the investigative file for future retrieval.

b3

Investigation on 03/23/2001 at Palos Hills, Illinois
File # 194B-CG-110663-302-73 Date dictated 03/26/2001
by SA [redacted] *rpw*

b6
b7C

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 01/31/2002

[redacted] work address [redacted]
 [redacted] work address [redacted]
 [redacted] work telephone numbers [redacted] and
 [redacted] was interviewed in his office at the [redacted]
 [redacted] in Chicago. After being advised of the identity of the
 interviewing agents and the nature of the interview, he provided
 the following information:

b6
b7C

[redacted] knows Calvin Sutker [redacted]
 [redacted] does not maintain a relationship with Sutker
 outside of [redacted] with the exception of a
 [redacted] that they each attended.

b6
b7C

When asked whether [redacted] was familiar with Sutker's
 staff, [redacted] stated that he knew only of one female with an
 Italian last name who worked for Sutker. [redacted] was shown a
 picture of [redacted] and asked whether he had ever seen
 [redacted] before. [redacted] stated that the picture was not good enough
 for him to say whether he had ever seen the individual before.

b6
b7C

[redacted] was aware that Sutker had been under
 investigation, but [redacted] and Sutker never spoke about it.

b6
b7C

[redacted] consists of [redacted] does
 not have any [redacted]

b6
b7C

[redacted] provided the following photocopies: contact
 information for the Commissioners; the 1999 Cook County Committee
 List; the 1999 Cook County Forest Preserve Committee List.

b6
b7CInvestigation on 01/24/2002 at Chicago, IllinoisFile # 194B-CG-110663 - 302-74 Date dictated _____

by SA [redacted] :jrh JPH

b6
b7C

194B-CG-110663

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 01/24/2002

[redacted] White, Male, Date of Birth: [redacted]
[redacted] Place of Birth: [redacted] Employment: [redacted]
[redacted] Telephone: [redacted] was interviewed

b6
b7C

[redacted] After being advised of the identities of the interviewing agents and the purpose of the interview, [redacted] voluntarily furnished the following information:

b6
b7C

[redacted] Commissioner Sutker work on Cook County Board matters to get legislation passed, however, [redacted] noted that they are not buddies.

b6
b7C

[redacted] Sutker's office is located approximately [redacted] [redacted] has observed a lot of turnover in Sutker's staff over the years. [redacted] Last Name Unknown (LNU) [redacted] Sutker. [redacted] was not aware of any independent contractors currently employed on Sutker's staff. [redacted] advised that Sutker's, [redacted] in each office know each other pretty well.

b6
b7C

The interviewing agents asked [redacted] about his knowledge of [redacted] responded that he knows [redacted] and was aware that he was [redacted] Sutker [redacted] has not seen [redacted] in the Board's office space in over a year. On approximately five occasions, [redacted] saw [redacted] Barbara Panozzo, coming or going in the Board's office space.

b6
b7C

[redacted] was not aware of any work whatsoever that [redacted] ever performed or was assigned. The interviewing agents showed [redacted] a photograph of [redacted] standing in front of a house. The interviewing agents asked [redacted] if he recognized the

b6
b7CInvestigation on 1/24/02 at Chicago, ILFile # 194B-CG-110663 - 302-75 Date dictated 1/24/02by SA [redacted] :kss KSSb6
b7C

024/KSS 01.302

194B-CG-110663

Continuation of FD-302 of [redacted], On 1/24/02, Page 2

individual in the photograph. [redacted] looked at the picture and identified the individual as [redacted]

b6
b7C

Concerning independent contractors, [redacted] was aware that [redacted]

However, in contrast to [redacted] was aware that [redacted] had heard that [redacted] was under investigation by the FBI as well. [redacted] does not have any independent contractors [redacted]

[redacted] was asked if he knew of any other employees that may have knowledge of [redacted] responded that [redacted]

b6
b7C

[redacted] during the time that [redacted] Sutker [redacted] As such, [redacted] may have knowledge of [redacted] currently works in [redacted] telephone [redacted] advised that [redacted] LNU and [redacted] LNU of [redacted] may have knowledge of [redacted]

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 01/25/2002

[redacted]
[redacted] was interviewed at his place of employment. After being advised of the identity of the interviewing agents and the purpose of the interview, [redacted] provided the following information:

[redacted] stated that he had heard the name PANOZZO and recognized BARBARA PANOZZO as an employee of Cook County Commissioner CALVIN SUTKER's staff. [redacted] indicated that he had never met or seen anyone named [redacted] was shown a picture of [redacted] and indicated that he had never seen the person in the photo before.

[redacted] indicated that he was aware that each Cook County Commissioner had three (3) full-time County employees in there budget and a fourth budgeted position that could be either a county employee or an independent contractor with no benefits. [redacted] stated that it was his understanding that the money allotted for the independent contractor position was raised slightly to compensate for the lack of benefits. [redacted] related that the independent contractor position could be more than one employee if an individual Commissioner wanted to hire several people.

[redacted] stated that he did not recall ever talking to Commissioner SUTKER or any other commissioner about the independent contractor position or the contract involved. [redacted] stated that

[redacted] stated that he was aware that [redacted] Commissioner SUTKER [redacted] but stated that he has not really discussed the investigation into [redacted] or why [redacted] SUTKER [redacted] with her. [redacted] stated that when [redacted] he learned

Investigation on 01/24/2002 at Chicago, Illinois

File # 194B-CG-110663-302-762 Date dictated 01/25/2002

by SA [redacted] :rpw
SA [redacted]

194B-CG-110663-302

Continuation of FD-302 of [REDACTED], On 01/24/2002, Page 2

b6
b7C

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] stated that when he decided to [REDACTED] he called
SUTKER and explained that he did not want SUTKER [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] stated that SUTKER was very
gracious and did not object at all.

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 01/24/2002

[redacted]
[redacted] work address [redacted]
[redacted] telephone number [redacted] was
interviewed at his place of business. After being advised of the
identities of the interviewing agents and the nature and purpose of
the interview, [redacted] provided the following information.

b6
b7C

[redacted] stated that [redacted]
[redacted]

b6
b7C

[redacted] stated that he had an idealistic notion that the
[redacted] was intended to serve the constituents of the
district he represented. According to [redacted] he very quickly
learned that the actual goal of public service was lost [redacted]
[redacted] stated that he believes that he is
[redacted] believed that
the city of Chicago is all of Cook County. [redacted] feels that it is
important to remind [redacted] that there are suburbs
and townships outside the city limits of Chicago that are still a
big part of Cook County. [redacted] claims to represent eight townships
with approximately 316,000 people.

b6
b7C

[redacted] acknowledged that [redacted]
with CALVIN SUTKER, however those were mostly the all inclusive
[redacted] believed
that SUTKER may serve on the Industrial Claims and Litigation
committee, but [redacted] noted that [redacted]
[redacted] but he was relatively certain he

b6
b7CInvestigation on 01/24/02 at Chicago, IllinoisFile # 194B-CG-110663 *302-77*Date dictated 01/24/02by SA [redacted] *FE*
SA [redacted] *IWW*b6
b7C

194B-CG-110663

Continuation of FD-302 of [REDACTED]

, On 01/24/02

, Page 2

b6
b7C

had seen him at a few. [REDACTED] then provided a copy of the commissioners and their respective committee assignments to the interviewing agents. The list is enclosed in a 1A envelope with the interview notes.

With regard to his personal knowledge of SUTKER's staff, [REDACTED] stated that because [REDACTED] Specifically, [REDACTED] believes that [REDACTED] SUTKER however he seems to recall that [REDACTED]

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] did not recognize the name [REDACTED] however he did know a BARBARA PANOZZO, a woman from the south suburbs, who is employed by SUTKER as his Chief of staff. According to [REDACTED] B. PANOZZO travels between the downtown office and their district office located somewhere in Skokie, Illinois. [REDACTED] noted that he does not believe that there are any other male staff or employees working for SUTKER. The last male he could recall [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] was provided an opportunity to view the color photograph of [REDACTED] and after a few moments of inspection, [REDACTED] stated that he did not recognize the individual pictured.

[REDACTED] independent contractors or even part-time employees. To the best of his knowledge the way that an independent contractor can be paid is by subdividing the salary allotted for one of his staff. According to [REDACTED] the fourth staff position, may be divided up in half or in quarters and individuals who would accrue no benefits, could work strictly for the compensation. [REDACTED] stated that the annual salary of \$32,900.00 could conceivably be split up to compensate individuals hired for a specific project or study and that they would need to report to the commissioner or his/her chief of staff. The only other alternative for compensation of an independent contractor would be through vouchers and purchase requisitions which would need to specifically list the contracting fees, hours worked, and details of the project. [REDACTED] suggested that [REDACTED] would be better suited to explain the voucher and requisition process. [REDACTED] believes that [REDACTED] better served by full time employees who are committed to their positions and duties. [REDACTED] stated that every commissioner is allocated the same amount of funding for four full-time staff. [REDACTED] was aware was [REDACTED]

b6
b7C

194B-CG-110663

Continuation of FD-302 of [REDACTED]

, On 01/24/02

, Page 3

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] In addition, [REDACTED]
stated that he requests that [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Aside from the general pleasantries of conversation and
[REDACTED] does not
communicate frequently with SUTKER. Further, [REDACTED] stated that
while he and SUTKER [REDACTED] he
did not attend SUTKER's function since SUTKER [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] stated that while [REDACTED]
was needed, the whole [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] excused himself from the interview citing the need
to [REDACTED] concerning the
[REDACTED] stated that it was particularly
important that he attend because he had [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] that were going to be reviewed. The interviewing agents
thanked [REDACTED] for his time and provided business cards with contact
numbers at the conclusion of the interview.

b6
b7C

194B-C6-110663-302-77



HW

b6
b7c

HW

03/row 02. 302

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 01/25/2002

[redacted] Social
Security Account Number [redacted], work telephone number
[redacted] is employed as [redacted]

b6
b7C

[redacted] After being advised of the
identities of the interviewing agents and the nature and purpose of
the interview, [redacted] provided the following information.

[redacted] indicated that he is [redacted] in
other words, he is [redacted] stated
that when he [redacted]

b6
b7C

[redacted] SUTKER

SUTKER [redacted] made a copy of
[redacted] and provided
it to the agents with his appointments circled. The copies of the
list are enclosed in a 1A envelope with the interview notes.

[redacted] stated that he knew or recognized the other
[redacted]
clarified that the work environment was not very cordial or
friendly. As an example, he stated that in one instance the

b6
b7C

[redacted]
While [redacted] are in large part civil with one another,
but there is very little camaraderie. [redacted] could specifically
recall a [redacted]

[redacted] SUTKER's office. [redacted] stated that [redacted] was
friendly and was a pleasant individual with whom to work. However,
[redacted] stated that [redacted] SUTKER and
that he believes that there are no male employees on SUTKER's
staff. [redacted] stated that SUTKER's chief of staff, BARBARA
PANOZZO was never really considered a friendly individual and that
she was the person, aside from SUTKER, that he saw frequently.

At this point in the interview, [redacted] stated to the
agents that what he was relating was based on office rumor and
third party statements that were made around [redacted]

b6
b7C

Investigation on 01/24/02 at Chicago, Illinois

File # 194B-CG-110663 - 302-78 Date dictated 01/25/02

SA [redacted]
SA [redacted] EWW

b6
b7C

194B-CG-110663

Continuation of FD-302 of [REDACTED]

, On 01/24/02

Page 2

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] could not identify the exact source of the following opinions, however he stated that they may be helpful with regard to the investigation. It was rumored that PANOZZO [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] SUTKER's staff [REDACTED] Further it was understood that SUTKER had also provided assistance [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Allegedly, SUTKER and [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] SUTKER [REDACTED] When specifically asked about [REDACTED] responded that "I wouldn't know him if I saw him." Agents then showed a photograph of [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] who after reviewing the picture, responded that he did not recall ever seeing the individual [REDACTED] [REDACTED] clarified that if the person ever did visit [REDACTED] he more than likely would have encountered him because [REDACTED] then recalled that [REDACTED] SUTKER was named [REDACTED] and may be able to provide more detailed information.

[REDACTED] explained his understanding of the Independent Contractor hiring process for commissioners. [REDACTED] stated that it is possible for commissioners to split the salary of their fourth staff position and hire someone without benefits to fill the part-time hours. In other words, two people could share a forty hour per week position without receiving vacation days, sick days, or other benefits yet receive compensation commensurate with their recorded hours. [REDACTED] stated that while [REDACTED]

b6
b7C

Further, [REDACTED] indicated that [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] In the end, [REDACTED] stated that at the root of any county position is trust. [REDACTED] stated that a good measure of whether the staff and commissioner are functioning efficiently is his or her daily schedule. If the commissioner is in the building and working, either on committees or meetings, then his staff will need to be present and doing their jobs too.

[REDACTED] was specifically questioned about his contacts with SUTKER [REDACTED]

b6
b7C

194B-CG-110663

Continuation of FD-302 of [REDACTED], On 01/24/02, Page 3

b6
b7C

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] stated the [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] issue seemed familiar but he was not certain why or to
what extent. [REDACTED] could not recall any specific interaction
with SUTKER or other members of his staff. Further, the only issue
[REDACTED] could recall was [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] SUTKER was

[REDACTED] stated that the ghost payroll rumor first
surfaced a few years ago. At that time, SUTKER merely became very
low key and avoided contacts with people [REDACTED]
When the issue flared up, SUTKER suddenly was not around very much.
[REDACTED] stated that there are probably many allies of the [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] who would not speak very well of SUTKER.

b6
b7C

At the conclusion of their conversation, the interviewing
agents provided business cards with contact numbers to [REDACTED]

b6
b7C

194B-CG-110663 -3-2-78

☐ PW

b6
b7C

no 03/rw 01.302

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 01/25/2002

[redacted]
[redacted] telephone [redacted] was interviewed at her place of employment. After being advised of the identity of the interviewing agents and the purpose of interview, [redacted] provided the following information:

b6
b7C

[redacted] stated that she does not know the name [redacted] and did not recall working with anyone from Commissioner CALVIN SUTKER's staff on anything. [redacted] was shown a picture of [redacted] and after indicating some difficulty in seeing the picture and placing a pair of glasses on, stated that she did not recognize the person in the photograph.

b6
b7C

[redacted] stated that she did not pay attention to the individuals on [redacted] Commissioner's staffs and does not know who works for who.

b6
b7C

[redacted] stated that the interviewing agents were wasting time and taxpayer money and stated that it would be impossible for the interviewing agents to prove if [redacted] [redacted] stated that the interviewing agents should do something worth while. [redacted] stated that the agents were on a witchhunt and would only succeed in ruining someone's good name. [redacted] stated that individual commissioners did not have enough staff to attend the community meetings as it was.

b6
b7C

[redacted] asked the interviewing agents how much the [redacted] [redacted] asked if it was around [redacted] and indicated that was a small amount. [redacted] pointed to a binded document relating to the [redacted] and stated that she could show the interviewing agents much larger amounts of taxpayer money being used improperly. When offered an opportunity to elaborate, [redacted] declined. [redacted] concluded the interview by stating that she understood the interviewing agents were doing their jobs and indicating that she did not have anything to add to the investigation.

b6
b7CInvestigation on 01/24/2002 at Chicago, IllinoisFile # 194B-CG-110663-302 ⁻⁷⁹ Date dictated 01/25/2002b6
b7Cby SA [redacted] :rpw
SA [redacted] *MA*

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 01/25/2002

[redacted]
[redacted] was interviewed at his place of employment. After being advised of the identity of the interviewing agents and the purpose of the interview, [redacted] provided the following information:

[redacted] stated that he knows a BARBARA PANOZZO on Cook County Commissioner CALVIN SUTKER's staff, but did not think that he knew anyone named [redacted]. [redacted] stated that BARBARA PANOZZO was the only person on CALVIN SUTKER's staff he recalled ever meeting. [redacted] was shown a picture of [redacted] and after asking if it was a guy or a lady, stated that he did not recognize the person in the photograph.

[redacted]
[redacted]
[redacted] related that he recognized the form as one used in the process of paying independent contractors in a Cook County Commissioners office. [redacted] stated that he did not recall discussing the form or using it as an example for anyone in Commissioner SUTKER's office.

[redacted] stated that he [redacted]
[redacted]

[redacted] stated that he did not recall working with SUTKER or his staff on anything. [redacted] stated that SUTKER was a nice guy, but they were from [redacted]. [redacted] explained that SUTKER was a Jewish Democrat [redacted]

Investigation on 01/24/2002 at Chicago, Illinois

File # 194B-CG-110663-302 - 89 Date dictated 01/24/2002

by SA [redacted]
SA [redacted]

rpw

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 02/07/2002

[redacted]
[redacted] was interviewed in the office of her attorney, [redacted]. After being advised of the identity of the interviewing agent and the purpose of the interview, [redacted] provided the following information:

b6
b7C

[redacted] related that she was hired on [redacted]
[redacted]

b6
b7C

[redacted] advised that in her position, she has regular contact with [redacted]
[redacted]

b6
b7C

[redacted] as an example of the type of work she did. [redacted] stated that the [redacted] or other matter that she recalled working on with Commissioner CALVIN SUTKER was a [redacted] stated that she had worked with SUTKER [redacted] did not recall working with anyone else on SUTKER's staff on this [redacted] stated that she did not recall any other specific work, [redacted] or otherwise, that she had worked on with or involving SUTKER.

[redacted] recalled that SUTKER was elected Cook County Commissioner in 1994 and estimated that she met him in early 1995. [redacted] indicated that she met BARBARA PANOZZO around the same time. [redacted] stated that she did not know SUTKER or BARBARA PANOZZO prior to SUTKER being elected a Cook County Commissioner. [redacted] stated that she talked to BARBARA PANOZZO more than SUTKER, but stated that how much varied [redacted] stated that she might see BARBARA PANOZZO [redacted]
[redacted]

b6
b7C

Investigation on 02/07/2002 at Chicago, Illinois

File # 194B-CG-110663-302-81 Date dictated 02/07/2002

by SA [redacted] :rpw *RPW*

b6
b7C

194B-CG-110663-302

Continuation of FD-302 of [REDACTED]

, On 02/07/2002 , Page 2

[REDACTED] characterized her relationship with BARBARA PANOZZO as [REDACTED] explained that she did not really socialize with BARBARA PANOZZO a great deal. [REDACTED] recalled two occasions which she would characterize as social with BARBARA PANOZZO. [REDACTED] SUTKER

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] BARBARA PANOZZO at [REDACTED] BARBARA PANOZZO [REDACTED] stated that she did not know when these took place. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] she would stop and say hello to BARBARA PANOZZO and maybe ask her opinion [REDACTED] explained that BARBARA PANOZZO was not a lawyer, so she was not [REDACTED] [REDACTED] stated that she could not recall any specific items that she had asked BARBARA PANOZZO's [REDACTED] stated that the only recent conversation she remembered having with BARBARA PANOZZO was a social conversation where BARBARA PANOZZO [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] initially characterized her relationship with [REDACTED] as "fleeting," then characterized [REDACTED] as someone she had "probably" been introduced to a while back, and finally as someone she had been introduced to approximately one month ago. [REDACTED] explained that approximately one month ago she was at a [REDACTED]

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] explained that by a couple of years earlier, she meant some time after the initial press reports about a ghost payrolling investigation involving SUTKER's office. [REDACTED] stated that at that time, she saw BARBARA PANOZZO standing at the back wall of the room [REDACTED] she "figured out" was [REDACTED] based on the press reports regarding the investigation. [REDACTED] then stated that she thought, but was not certain it was him. [REDACTED] stated that she thought that [REDACTED] with BARBARA PANOZZO [REDACTED] and indicated that she thought that he looked familiar. [REDACTED] did not

194B-CG-110663-302

Continuation of FD-302 of [REDACTED]

, On 02/07/2002 , Page 3

specifically recall meeting or seeing [REDACTED] on any other occasions.

[REDACTED] stated that she knew BARBARA PANOZZO [REDACTED] and seen him approximately a dozen times. [REDACTED] described [REDACTED] white male who worked for [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] sometimes [REDACTED] and recalled seeing him there.

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] was directed by the interviewing agent to the time frame of December, 1998 through the end of 1999. [REDACTED] stated that she did not have any conversations with [REDACTED] during this time frame and did not have any conversations with anyone else when SUTKER was around. [REDACTED] stated that she did not have any conversations with anyone from SUTKER's office or otherwise, about any work that [REDACTED] had done during that time frame or any other time frame. [REDACTED] stated that she did not recall any conversation at any time, with anyone that involved work that [REDACTED] had done for SUTKER.

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] stated that she is aware that during the time frame of December, 1998 through the end of 1999, BARBARA PANOZZO, [REDACTED] SUTKER's office. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] SUTKER [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] was not [REDACTED] stated that she is aware that a woman named [REDACTED] LNU is SUTKER [REDACTED]

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] stated that she had one or two brief conversations with BARBARA PANOZZO about the investigation into ghost payrolling after the initial newspaper articles came out. [REDACTED] stated that BARBARA PANOZZO made some "indirect remarks" about the investigation, but never made any specific remarks about work that [REDACTED] explained that one time after the newspaper articles first came out, she asked BARBARA PANOZZO [REDACTED] BARBARA PANOZZO [REDACTED] recalled another time asking BARBARA PANOZZO [REDACTED] BARBARA PANOZZO responded [REDACTED] stated that it was clear to her in both of these conversations that they were talking about the investigation. [REDACTED] stated that she recalled feeling sorry for BARBARA PANOZZO [REDACTED] because they were going through a tough time.

b6
b7C

194B-CG-110663-302

Continuation of FD-302 of [REDACTED], On 02/07/2002, Page 4

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] stated that she never talked to BARBARA PANOZZO, CALVIN SUTKER or anyone else about [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] stated that she does not currently know and never knew what [REDACTED] SUTKER was [REDACTED] SUTKER. [REDACTED] stated that she had never had a conversation with anyone about any [REDACTED] SUTKER. [REDACTED] stated that she is not aware of anyone that has any knowledge of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] had done. [REDACTED] stated that she has never heard anyone say that they are aware [REDACTED] SUTKER. [REDACTED] stated that the only specifics about [REDACTED] [REDACTED] she was aware of came from a newspaper article written by Robert Becker that mentioned the NORTH SHORE MOSQUITO ABATEMENT DISTRICT.

At the conclusion of the interview, [REDACTED] stated that she did not believe that she had any other information relevant to the investigation.

b6
b7C

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 02/11/2002

[redacted]
[redacted] was interviewed at his office, [redacted]
[redacted] telephone [redacted]. After being advised
of the identity of the interviewing agent and the purpose of the
interview, [redacted] provided the following information:

b6
b7C

[redacted] advised that he has [redacted]
[redacted] advised that [redacted]
[redacted] Commissioner CALVIN SUTKER's district, the 13th
District [redacted] covered portions of Morton Grove, Illinois.
[redacted] SUTKER [redacted]
[redacted] but he could not recall any
[redacted] stated that he never discussed
[redacted] with anyone on SUTKER's staff. [redacted] stated
that he had also worked on [redacted] SUTKER,
but not after 1998.

b6
b7C

[redacted] stated that he was aware of the following
individuals working, past or present, in SUTKER's office: BARBARA
PANOZZO [redacted] stated that he
said hello and had brief social conversations with [redacted] and
[redacted] but had never discussed any substantive issues or worked
with them on any [redacted] stated that he had
probably talked with SUTKER and BARBARA PANOZZO [redacted]
but could not recall any specific items. [redacted] advised that he
was not aware of anyone [redacted]
SUTKER's staff on anything related to the Cook County.

b6
b7C

[redacted] related that he had met BARBARA PANOZZO [redacted]
[redacted] but had never met [redacted] or any of BARBARA
PANOZZO [redacted] related that he was aware that
[redacted]
[redacted] stated that he was not aware if [redacted] had
worked for SUTKER or not. [redacted] stated that he was not aware
of anyone who had worked with [redacted] in any capacity for
SUTKER and did know of anyone who had knowledge of work [redacted]
[redacted] did or did not do in SUTKER's office.

b6
b7C

[redacted] stated that he was aware that [redacted]
[redacted] budget for three full-time county positions and

b6
b7CInvestigation on 02/07/2002 at Chicago, IllinoisFile # 194B-CG-110663-302 - 82 Date dictated 02/11/2002by SA [redacted] rpwb6
b7C

194B-CG-110663-302

Continuation of FD-302 of [REDACTED]

, On 02/07/2002, Page 2

b6
b7C

a fourth position that could be either a full-time county position or an independent contractor position. [REDACTED] stated that it was his understanding that the independent contractor position money could be used for one or more independent contractors or for purchasing office items, such as computers. [REDACTED] stated that

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] all county employees, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] stated that he does not believe [REDACTED] an independent contractor, but stated that [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] indicated that he has never seen a written policy or rules on the independent contractor position/money, but has seen it in the Cook County Budget. [REDACTED] did not recall ever discussing the independent contractor position/money with any [REDACTED] commissioner or staff member, including SUTKER and SUTKER's staff. [REDACTED] stated that he did not recall ever seeing an actual contract for independent services and had never discussed one with SUTKER or anyone on SUTKER's staff.

[REDACTED] advised that [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] stated that he understood the term "community outreach" to mean attending the above-referenced community meetings as well as establish and maintain contacts with groups

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] advised that he [REDACTED]

194B-CG-110663-302

Continuation of FD-302 of [REDACTED], On 02/07/2002, Page 3

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] community outreach group with various organizations, but stated that it is not in place yet.

[REDACTED] advised that the most significant thing that he could recall regarding the Board of Commissioners in 1998 was that it was an election year. [REDACTED] reiterated that he might have been involved with SUTKER [REDACTED] but could not recall any specifics.

At the conclusion of the interview, [REDACTED] inquired as to whether or not the interviewing agent had seen a press release that SUTKER's office had recently released concerning the investigation into ghost payrolling. [REDACTED] provided a photocopy of the press release, which is attached and incorporated into this report.

b6
b7C



CALVIN R. SUTKER
COMMISSIONER OF THE COOK COUNTY BOARD AND
THE FOREST PRESERVE DISTRICT

COUNTY BUILDING
118 N. CLARK STREET
ROOM 567
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60602
(312) 603-6383
(312) 603-3622 FAX

DISTRICT OFFICE
4121 W. MAIN STREET
SKOKIE, ILLINOIS 60076
(847) 673-1219
(847) 673-2535 FAX

PRESS RELEASE
FROM THE OFFICE OF CALVIN R. SUTKER

FBI agents have been asking questions about my office and about a young man who performed contract services several years ago for approximately ten months. I hoped that this investigation had been closed during the extended period of inactivity since I first learned of the inquiry. Apparently, it was not. The person about whom the FBI is asking questions is a fine young man who did perform services for me in my official capacity during the time he was under contract.

Because of the existence of the federal investigation, I will not have further public comment on this matter.

-30-

January 25, 2002

SERVING THE COMMUNITIES OF SKOKIE, EVANSTON, WILMETTE, WINNETKA, GLENCOE, KENILWORTH
AND IN CHICAGO, 49TH AND 50TH WARDS



Printed on Recycled Paper

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 02/11/2002

[redacted]
[redacted]
[redacted] telephone [redacted]
[redacted] was interviewed at her place of business. After being
advised of the identity of the interviewing agent and the purpose
of the interview, [redacted] provided the following information:

b6
b7C

[redacted] stated that she has been in her current position
[redacted] stated that prior to
that she worked for [redacted] for approximately
[redacted]

b6
b7C

[redacted] stated that her current position consists of
[redacted]

b6
b7C

[redacted] explained that
she personally tries not to get involved in [redacted]
[redacted]

[redacted] explained that she has a lot of [redacted]
[redacted]

[redacted] stated that the only [redacted] that she
recalls working with Cook County Commissioner CALVIN SUTKER on is
[redacted] stated that [redacted] has
taken place a couple of times, each time in [redacted] but is not
necessarily [redacted] recalled working with SUTKER
and BARBARA PANOZZO. [redacted]

b6
b7C

[redacted] stated that she did not recall any contact with
anyone else from SUTKER's office on the event. [redacted] stated
that she may have worked with someone on SUTKER's staff [redacted]
[redacted] but stated
that she did not recall anything specific.

Investigation on 02/07/2002 at Chicago, Illinois

File # 194B-CG-110663-302 - 83 Date dictated 02/11/2002

by SA [redacted]:rpw^{2PW}

b6
b7C

194B-CG-110663-302

Continuation of FD-302 of [REDACTED]

, On 02/07/2002 , Page 2

[REDACTED] stated that knows or has met some of the people who have worked on SUTKER's staff in the past, as well as SUTKER's

[REDACTED] stated that SUTKER [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] stated that she was not sure if [REDACTED] SUTKER

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] SUTKER. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] stated that she recalled that [REDACTED] SUTKER.

[REDACTED] stated that she thought that she recalled another man working for SUTKER [REDACTED] SUTKER, but stated that she did not know his name. [REDACTED] stated that she did not believe that this person [REDACTED] [REDACTED] stated that SUTKER's current [REDACTED] who's name she does not know.

[REDACTED] stated that she does not recall ever being told that [REDACTED] SUTKER or ever observing him in SUTKER's office. [REDACTED] stated that she recognizes the name as being [REDACTED] but does not specifically recall meeting him. [REDACTED] stated that she [REDACTED] and specifically recalls meeting BARBARA PANOZZO [REDACTED] there. [REDACTED] stated that she recalled meeting BARBARA PANOZZO [REDACTED] because BARBARA PANOZZO told her that [REDACTED]

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] but was not sure.

[REDACTED] stated that she was aware of the investigation involving [REDACTED] and that people [REDACTED] were talking about it. [REDACTED] stated that she was not aware of anyone who claimed that they had worked with [REDACTED] or had seen him working on something County-related.

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] advised that she attended some, but not all, of the [REDACTED] but did not recall seeing [REDACTED] there. [REDACTED] advised that she was probably at [REDACTED] for different reasons that most and might not have had any reason to notice if he was there or not. [REDACTED] explained that she would have been looking to run into or make contacts at [REDACTED]

b6
b7C

194B-CG-110663-302

Continuation of FD-302 of [REDACTED], On 02/07/2002, Page 3

b6
b7C

[REDACTED] related that she was an [REDACTED]
in [REDACTED] who talked to a lot of people. [REDACTED]
believed that might be why someone might think that she would know
[REDACTED] if in fact [REDACTED] SUTKER.

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 02/07/2002

[redacted]
[redacted] was interviewed at his office, [redacted]
[redacted] phone number [redacted]. After being advised
of the identities of the interviewing agents and the nature of the
interview, he provided the following information:

b6
b7C

[redacted] is located at [redacted]
[redacted] phone number [redacted].
Additionally, [redacted]

b6
b7C

[redacted] was asked if he knew [redacted] to which he
responded negatively. [redacted] advised that he knew of BARBARA
PANOZZO, who is CALVIN SUTKER's secretary. [redacted] stated that he
[redacted] In addition, he
is a [redacted] SUTKER
[redacted] and SUTKER do not socialize
with each other. [redacted] stated that he and SUTKER, if they have
business, conduct their business in the office. The interviewing
agents then asked [redacted] if he was aware of SUTKER's current legal
problems. [redacted] stated that he only had a partial understanding
of SUTKER's problems and that SUTKER never spoke about any of his
legal problems with [redacted]

b6
b7C

[redacted] was asked if he has had or currently has any
[redacted] advised that
between [redacted] worked
for him [redacted]

b6
b7C

[redacted] provided the interviewing agents with a list of
[redacted] This
list will be maintained in a 1-A envelope.

b6
b7CInvestigation on 01/24/2002 at Chicago, IllinoisFile # 194B-CG-110663-302-84

Date dictated _____

by SA [redacted] [redacted]
SA [redacted] [redacted]b6
b7C

- 1 -

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 02/05/2002

[redacted]
[redacted]
[redacted] telephone [redacted] was interviewed at her place of employment. After being advised of the identity of the interviewing agents and the purpose of the interview, [redacted] provided the following information:

b6
b7C

[redacted] advised that in her position with [redacted]
[redacted] she is responsible for [redacted]
[redacted]

b6
b7C

[redacted] stated that in her position as [redacted]
[redacted] she has come to know [redacted] stated that she knows that [redacted] BARBARA PANOZZO, works for Commissioner CALVIN SUTKER. [redacted] indicated that [redacted] is affiliated with SUTKER in some way, but she does not know exactly how or if [redacted] SUTKER. [redacted] explained that "awhile back" she remembered seeing [redacted] stated that she was unsure exactly how long ago it was and she did not know if the seeing [redacted] lasted for only a period of days, a period of weeks, or longer. [redacted] related that it is difficult for her to get to know [redacted] that work [redacted] or what they are doing. [redacted] stated that she did not know if [redacted] SUTKER's district office.

b6
b7C

[redacted] stated that she did not know if [redacted] was [redacted] or not when she saw him, but only remembered seeing him coming in and going out for a period of time. [redacted] stated that she did not recall ever receiving [redacted] or having someone come to [redacted] for an appointment or looking for [redacted] stated that she did not recall ever receiving a phone call for [redacted] or directing one to him. [redacted] stated that [redacted]

b6
b7CInvestigation on 02/01/2002 at Chicago, IllinoisFile # 194B-CG-110663-302 - 85 Date dictated 02/05/2002by SA [redacted]:rpw
SA [redacted]b6
b7C

194B-CG-110663-302

Continuation of FD-302 of [REDACTED], On 02/01/2002, Page 2

b6
b7C

had their own lines and she [REDACTED] so it was
unlikely that she would [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] stated that she did not recall ever [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] for any reason.